



£826









**SEXUAL PROBLEMS OF  
TO-DAY**



# SEXUAL PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY

BY

Lieut.-Col. W. Shirley, C.M.G., M.A. ; Rev. W. H. H. Elliott, M.A. ;  
3 Miss Helena L. Powell ; Mary Scharlieb, C.B.E., M.D., M.S. ;  
Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D. ; Rev. Eric Graham, M.A. ;  
Rev. Father Andrew, S.D.C.

EDITED BY

MARY SCHARLIEB, C.B.E., M.D., M.S.

LONDON

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE, LTD.

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

*[Printed in Great Britain]*



## INTRODUCTION.

THIS volume of essays which deals with certain moral problems of the present day is the outcome of the deliberations of a Committee of citizens who are sincerely anxious to further the real interests of the body politic, and to uphold such a standard of individual, family, and social life as may extend the kingdom of God on earth. It is no part of our mission to hurt other people's feelings nor to find fault with their judgments and their methods of life. We do not arrogate to ourselves the position of judge, nor do we claim any approximation to infallibility in the methods and views that we humbly suggest for the consideration of our fellow men and women. We have our own views and our own standards, our convictions are dear to us, and we are prepared to follow them to the best of our poor ability. We know that our standards are based on the truths of religion, the obligations of morality, and the charities of human life; in so far as our interpretations of these standards are correct we thank God that He has revealed them to us, and in so far as they are faulty, we humbly admit that "to err is human, to pardon is divine."

The sexual and moral problems, the social

enigmas set before us by the circumstances of our race and of our times are numerous, and we have had to make a selection of some of the most urgent of these problems which we are anxious to place before our readers, and of which we are honestly endeavouring to indicate a reasonable solution. It appears to us that underlying the sexual and the moral problems of the present day there is a Master-Problem of which each of the smaller and individual dilemmas are at once the indication and the offspring. We are convinced that this great source of present day difficulties is to be found in the fact that although the majority of thinking people are seeking the good of the race they are not seeking it in the best way. The aspirations of mankind, even when they may be classified as more or less worthy aspirations, are all too apt to be bounded by the comparatively narrow circle of what is good for the body. The immense majority of us desire, and more or less consistently seek, to promote the physical well-being of the race. Of these aspirations many have been fulfilled, and during the last hundred years improvements in water supply, in drainage, in the control of epidemics, in facilities of locomotion, and even in the diminution of soot and dirt in our great cities, have made life and health both more secure and more enjoyable. Other reformers have gone further and have considered the psychical needs. To them we owe improvements in education, especially the provision of the so-called educational ladder, greatly increased facilities for the higher education of both men and

women, the increase of the available amount of pure and useful literature, the reform of our prison system, the amelioration of Poor Law and other social legislation. Still, these and numerous other reforms affect chiefly the intellectual and moral side of our nature, and while they are likely to give us better educated citizens, and to raise the tone and improve the outlook of thousands, it is quite evident that even these reforms, great, far reaching, and valuable as they are, do not go far enough, and do not provide for the nourishment, purification, and education of the immortal part of man, they do nothing directly for his spirit, and are utterly unconcerned with his preparation for eternity.

By virtue of the first set of reforms we, and our fellow citizens, have the opportunity of becoming healthy and comfortable animals, well fed, well clothed, well housed, protected from the ravages of disease, poverty, and dirt; by the influence of reforms of the second type we may become civilised, cultured, law-abiding pagans: but unless our reformers can raise their eyes, and widen their scope so that their bounties may include the nourishment, purification, and development of the immortal element in our triune being, the whole undertaking must end in failure. It is the old counsel of despair — “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” The danger of the present day appears to us to lie in the flood of materialism that has risen so fast of late years, and which threatens to engulf human nature and to drown its aspirations in a self-seeking hedonism. It looks



as if we were likely to escape from our former miseries of mind and body only for our souls to fall victims to selfishness and self-indulgence. It is materialism and the unchecked pursuit of what is pleasant and gratifying for the moment that underlies all our sexual and moral difficulties.

We think that it is expedient to consider the individual dilemmas issuing from the great Master - Problem under seven heads:—

1. The moral difficulties which surround those who whether they be parents, schoolmasters, or other guardians, have the care of little children.
2. The difficulties and dangers incidental to the growth and development of adolescent boys.
3. The very similar, but still more urgent and difficult, problems which arise during the development of adolescent girls.
4. The difficulties associated with courtship, betrothal, and marriage, difficulties which are made greater and more urgent inasmuch as two individuals instead of one are to be considered.
5. A difficulty which has only recently been openly discussed, although it has been in existence in various forms since olden days, i.e. the question of the family, and the best methods of dealing with it under present day circumstances.
6. The still more burning question of divorce, which during the last fifty years or so has come more and more under popular discussion, and which presents ever increasing difficulties to

those who are seeking the solid and permanent welfare of our people.

7. The last subject for consideration in the book is one as old as society itself. The subject—Prostitution—is one which of late years has been raised from an unmentionable horror to a condition on which some ray of light is shed and which is beginning to make an appeal to the deeper charities of the human heart.

The gathering together of men and women who were able and willing to contribute such a selection of articles was by no means easy, and in two instances, at least, the difficulties seemed to be well nigh insuperable. The very men and women who appeared to be designed by Providence as collaborators in the work could not recognise the call, and sometimes undue self-depreciation, scrupulosity or failure of health prevented the acceptance of this great responsibility. Finally, however, there is much reason for thankfulness to God the Holy Ghost Who has inspired the hearts and minds of my valued fellow workers, and to Whom alone is all praise due for what is good and sound in this volume.

The first essay is written by Lieut.-Colonel W. Shirley, C.M.G., M.A., Headmaster of Pinewood School, Farnborough, Hampshire. He is well qualified to deal with the moral education and difficulties of children. He has been engaged in teaching many years, and for the last five he has had very special experience in the management of children between the ages of seven and fourteen.

The second paper, on Adolescent Boys, is contributed by the Rev. W. H. H. Elliott, M.A., Rector of Cheddington, and late Head of Cambridge House. The corresponding paper on Adolescent Girls is written by Miss Helena L. Powell, the Principal of S. Mary's College, Paddington. Miss Powell has spent some 40 years in the teaching and management of adolescent girls, and she understands their peculiar and varied psychology so far as anyone can be said to understand it. Her paper is the outcome of experience, wisdom, and charity.

I am responsible for the chapter on Courtship, Betrothal, and Marriage.

The very difficult section on the Control of Conception has been written by Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D. He has dealt with the subject chiefly from the racial and economic point of view. These are aspects of the difficulty with which the author is exceptionally qualified to deal. His long and wide experience as Chief Medical Officer to the Local Government Board afforded him ample opportunity for studying the effects of the falling birth rate on national efficiency.

The article on Divorce comes from the pen of the Rev. Eric Graham, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford. He has brought to his difficult subject much learning, wisdom, and charity. By his learning he shows that the mind of the Western Church is still in accordance with the mind of her Master, by his skill he marshals his facts and arguments so as to show the reasonableness and the social value of the sanctity of marriage, while

he tenderly and charitably sympathises with the unhappy individuals whose life's happiness has been wrecked through inadvertence or dire misfortune. He sympathises, as we ought all to sympathise, with the suffering, but he inexorably demands that we shall seek happiness by the path of duty, and not in the crooked ways of self-indulgence.

The last essay in the book, which is on "Prostitution," was written by Father Andrew of the Society of Divine Compassion, and shows a large measure of that hatred of sin and love of the sinner which prompted his Master's memorable verdict on an unfortunate woman—"Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more."

-

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION. By the Editor . . . . .	vii.
I.—SEXUAL PROBLEMS IN CHILDHOOD. By Lieut.- Colonel W. Shirley, C.M.G., M.A. . . . .	1
II.—THE CARE OF ADOLESCENT BOYS. By Rev. W. H. H. Elliott, M.A. . . . .	63
III.—THE PROBLEM OF THE ADOLESCENT GIRL. By Miss Helena Powell . . . . .	97
IV.—COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE. By Mary Scharlieb, C.B.E., M.D., M.S. . . . .	118
V.—THE CONTROL OF CONCEPTION. By Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D. . . . .	147
VI.—DIVORCE. By Rev. Eric Graham, M.A. . . . .	173
VII.—PROSTITUTION. By Rev. Father Andrew, S.D.C. . . . .	212
APPENDIX . . . . .	240



# SEXUAL PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY

## SEXUAL PROBLEMS IN CHILDHOOD.

BY LIEUT.-COLONEL W. SHIRLEY, C.M.G., M.A.

I approach my subject with *fear* ! It is an unsavoury subject anyhow, it is one on which few men have ventured to proclaim their opinions and, as far as I know, none have dared to publish statistics. It is above all dangerous for a schoolmaster to discuss this subject for the obvious inference is that he has drawn his conclusions from his own pupils, and that his school must be a sink of iniquity. Fortunately, however, that cannot truthfully be said of me or my school. It happens that I have been a schoolmaster for only  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years, and have had little more than 100 past and present members of my school ; but, during the 16 years before I became a schoolmaster, I had over 10,000 young men of the educated classes through my hands, of whom the great majority came from all the public schools in the country, besides numbers of Boy Scouts. I have known intimately some thousands of well-educated young men and respectable lads, and, from what they



said of their schools, their comrades, and their relations with the other sex, and from what priests and doctors have told me, I ought to know a good deal of sexual matters among the boys and girls of this country. I have at least had plenty of opportunity during the last 21 years to study my subject, and I have done my best to seize my opportunities, but I cannot quote published statistics on this question.

As to the very unpleasant subject of "immorality" among boys—I heard one of our greatest Headmasters quoted to the effect that 90 per cent. of small boys were addicted to it. On appealing to him for confirmation of this opinion, he replied: "I do not think that I ever committed myself to the percentage quoted. It was, however, given to me by a well-known School Medical Officer long ago. My experience since then leads me to believe that the figure is too high, but I should still say that the majority of boys are at some time of their lives victims of the habit." Another well-known man who has kept careful records over a number of years, quotes me a percentage of *small* boys as given to self-abuse, which is much in excess of a bare "majority" but, he says, "many of these come into the hands of good Preparatory School or House Masters and abandon the habit with the result that most boys are free from the vice by the time they come to leave their public schools."

From what soldiers and others of similar social position have told me I should say that "immorality" is much higher among children of the poorer

classes, and that sexual intercourse among quite small children is not uncommon; but, from what I have seen of the clerk and petit commercant classes in this country, I believe that their sexual morality is higher than obtains in any other class—their views of morals in general may be narrow, but they are strict.

As I have said, "I cannot quote published statistics on this question," and I am quite prepared to find plenty of people who will denounce the suggestion that self-abuse is really rife among children. I have it, however, from thousands of young men with whom I have been intimate these many years past that there was a great deal of immorality in their Preparatory and Public Schools, but that it was extremely seldom that anybody made any effort to look for it. From this one may fairly conclude that most people who have the care of children either cannot or will not see what is under their noses.

If the amount of immorality is really trivial, why has the "Headmasters' Conference" discussed it, why did "The Association of Preparatory Schools" invite Dr. Crichton Miller to deliver an address which I quote later, why have none of these Principals of Preparatory Schools ever demurred to the obvious assumptions of the lecturer, why are boys every now and then required to leave their schools on account of "immorality," and what is our own knowledge of conditions during our own childhood? In considering the last two points we have to remember that *small* boys of the better classes almost invariably conceal their habit even

from their school-fellows, while bigger boys are very careful to conceal their vices from all but their particular companions in vice; and, therefore, we never get to know more than a fraction of what goes on. My point is that, whatever the *percentage* may be, "the *majority* of boys are at some time of their lives victims of this habit" and that is quite enough for my present purpose.

Since the evil exists, *it must be put a stop to*. If you choose to learn the signs, it is almost always easy to "spot" a boy who is "a victim of this habit" and, if you are trusted by him, it is easy to elicit a confession. Now—what are you going to do about it—expel him? If "the *majority* of boys are at some time of their lives victims of this habit," it follows that quite half the boys at schools will be "spotted," will confess, and will be expelled; and the odds are that your own boy will sooner or later suffer this fate. It is not only absurd to think of expelling half the boys at our schools, but I am going to show that, as a rule, the habit is contracted in ignorance, and that you might almost as well expel a boy for getting measles.

Anyway, is expulsion a *cure*? Is it compatible with Christian charity and mercy? Is it the way the law of the land deals with a "first offender"? And, as these first offenders are children, and may very well include *your* child, do you agree that your child should be expelled? You send your child to school to be cured of his faults—he is bound to have faults because *humanum est errare*. It is the duty of the schoolmaster and school-

*mistress to look for and cure all faults*—why expel a child for one fault, and not for others, unless the child prove incorrigible? Is this not a shirking of one's duty?

It may be urged that “victims of this habit”—you will note this good and great man says “habit,” not “vice”—are centres of infection. I deny it as far as *small* boys are concerned, for small boys almost invariably practise the habit *solus*. And, after all, apart from one's duty to one's pupils, is it not better to look for, discover, and *cure* these “centres of infection” instead of shutting one's eyes and leaving them to infect others. These “centres of infection” are almost always easy to discover and to cure. It is the very deceitful and untruthful boy who is difficult either to convict or to cure — *this* is the lad who might well be got rid of.

I have been very greatly struck by an address on “The Analytical Aspect of the Sex Problem Among Boys” given in January, 1920, at the Annual Conference of the Association of Preparatory Schools by Dr. H. Crichton Miller, M.D., M.A. For purposes of comment, I have divided the address into two parts, and each part into a number of sections, and I have taken the second part first. Throughout the italics are mine.

**“THE ANALYTICAL ASPECT OF THE SEX PROBLEM  
AMONG BOYS.” PART II.**

**THE PROBLEM.**

Dr. Miller said that he would divide “the normal emotional development of a boy” into four stages, namely: —

- I. *The Mother Phase* (0-8): “The child is born completely auto-erotic (self-loving), but very early his emotional interest begins to flow out towards his mother, whom he associates with ideas of nourishment, comfort, protection.”
- II. *The Father Phase* (8-12): “Somewhere about the age of 7 to 9 he ought to begin to hero-worship his father, emulating his self-confidence, self-assertion, and independence. You find him expressing ambitions that begin with the phrase ‘When I am a big man like Daddy . . .’ Of course, a great many boys go to boarding-schools much earlier than 12, and I do not criticise this practice—far from it. Indeed, when there is no father at home, or when the father does not lend himself to hero-worship, or when the mother obtrudes herself between the boy and his father, only good can come of so early a detachment from home influences.”
- III. *The School-fellow Phase* (12-18): “The boy is still conscious of dependence, but in this period he makes a considerable step

towards independence, and indulges in such phrases as 'When I am a prefect . . . ' or 'I hope I'll be in the XI. . . '. This is the period when the changes of adolescence reach a crisis. It is, therefore, the time of greatest importance to us."

IV. *The Mate Phase* (18-on): "Somewhere about the age of 18 the youth should begin to manifest an interest in the opposite sex. This is the beginning of the mating stage."

*Note 1.* "In the strictest sense of the word the 1st and 4th stages are hetero-sexual (Mother and Mate), while the 2nd and 3rd are homo-sexual (Father or Schoolmaster, and School-fellows)."

*Note 2.* "Now this is a truth of paramount importance. Homo-sexuality in the adult is regarded as a monstrous perversion; it is punishable by law, and it horrifies public opinion. This is sociologically correct. It is unfortunate, however, that we should allow ourselves to regard with the same instinctive dislike and to treat with a similar intolerance homo-sexual practices during the 2nd and 3rd phases. The thing is deplorable, but it is normal."\*

*Note 3.* "Now this rotation of phases is important from the point of view of manliness and character growth. The two intermediate phases should be truly homo-sexual from an emotional point of view. That is to say, the

\* See what I have said about expulsion.

mother influence must not be a dominant factor in either of these phases (8-18).<sup>\*</sup> Most people of sense know this, and all schoolmasters know it to their sorrow. The mother who obtrudes herself between a boy of 8 to 18 and his father or schoolmaster is the one who does the active mischief. If you are out to make a man of her boy, she is out to defeat you, and in a large proportion of cases she is successful. I am firmly convinced that, as far as the so-called upper classes go, the mothers of England are deteriorating. They are breeding small families of darlings, and are too selfish to forego the mother's privilege of emotional domination at an age when that should have been left behind. They are bent on making their boys happy and cannot appreciate the truth that '*God has willed that human happiness should be, not an accident, but a moral achievement.*' They do not know the meaning of the word 'self-realisation' and are complacently blind to the fact that their influence is rendering this impossible for their boys."

*Note 4.* But your schoolmasters are often the allies of these mothers. Every time that you appeal to a schoolboy in the name of his mother: every time you make use of that emotional lever, you are retarding his development. The result may be what you desired,

<sup>\*</sup> It is worse still when the "Nanny" or governess is the "dominant factor" after a boy is eight.

but the method was wrong. From 8 to 18 approximately every emotional appeal must be based on the claim of growth, progress, virility. I once had a patient of 32 who boasted that he had never chosen a suit of clothes without consulting his mother—would you be surprised to hear he was an active homo-sexual and a masturbator. To me the one statement is little more than a corollary of the other. Work on the schoolboy's idealism of manhood; make him feel that it is only a quibbler who can interpret failure in sexual temptation as other than defeat. Challenge him to 'Vindicate himself under heaven as a God-made man'\* but not, for any sake not, as a worthy little son of his demonstrative mother."

*Note 5.* "Mothers are not, however, always to blame for the production of the 'Mother's darling.' From the Father Phase to the Mother Phase regression very frequently takes place:—

- a. If the father shows himself to be harsh, unsympathetic or actively cruel during the Mother Phase, the boy remains in that phase. He never progresses to phase II. He is a mother's darling created by the father's failure—not by the mother's.
- b. If, on the other hand, the boy himself

\* If you have created the right "atmosphere," of which I speak later, you can appeal on other and stronger grounds as well, and your whole appeal will be ever so much more effective.



comes into collision with the father's injustice or tyranny, he tends to develop the rebel psychology: all authority savours of the father, and *he* was a tyrant. These are the boys who grow up to be heretics, cranks, members of minorities, and bachelors—not so much because they are regressive but from mere heresy.”

*Note 6.* “Finally I beg you (schoolmasters) to remember that *your business in life is character-formation*. If you have any other conception of education than this, the sooner your successors are appointed the better for society. The whole examination system is a necessary evil; but if you let yourselves become mere crammers, if you yield to senseless parents whose one test of your efficiency is your power to get their boy through a certain entrance or scholarship examination, if you let character go in working for a scholastic end, you are doing a great wrong \* *you are keeping a boy from realising himself*. His sex life is intimately bound up in this; his parental influences are immensely important; but you, after all, should have it in your power to lead the boy to self-realisation, whatever that may mean to him, whether it be classics or music, mathematics or art, athletics or personal purity.”

\* See also “Children overworked,” on p. 86.

## COMMENTS ON PART II.

I. I would prefer to divide the four stages of “the normal emotional development of a boy” into :—

1. The Mother Phase (0-8) \*
2. The Father or Preparatory School Phase (8-14) †
3. The School-fellows or Public-School Phase (14-19)
4. The Mate Phase (19-on).

II. Re “Note 2” : “The thing is deplorable but it is normal.” I believe that very small boys are scarcely aware that they are doing wrong, indeed, a doctor told me quite recently that he had one patient 4 months old and another 8 months old who had commenced to play with themselves. Even older boys are scarcely *fully* conscious of the immorality of the habit into which they had usually fallen when very young.

III. Re “Note 3” : “small families of darlings”

\* I regard this as the most important phase of all. The Jesuits are alleged to have said “Give me your child till it is seven and you can do what you like with it afterwards,” I am certain that the *good* which a child learns at its mother’s knee during this phase can never be permanently destroyed—he or she will return like “the prodigal son.”

† Because a boy begins to attain the age of puberty between thirteen and fourteen rather than at twelve; and because, if he goes to a Preparatory School, he remains there till about fourteen.

—this seems to me more particularly true of the wealthiest classes, and I know of a school-master who has actually admitted that his boys, destined for the most fashionable schools, are quite unable to cope at football with the hardier sons of less wealthy parents.

When I was at a certain great Institution, it was a saying among my colleagues: "If a boy's a rotter, bet he's got no father." This did not necessarily imply that the father was dead but that, owing to his absence abroad or some such reason, the boy had lacked a father's influence. I have no doubt whatever that where a father is unable to be a companion to his boy—if, for instance, he has to get off to work early in the morning and does not return till late in the evening—a boy had much better be sent to a boarding-school. If there be any truth in this saying which I have quoted, I venture to offer the following explanations:—

- a. You cannot give what you have not got and, therefore, a woman cannot teach manliness—in fact, the more womanly she is, the less able is she to do so.
- b. A woman who is suddenly deprived of the physical companionship of her husband is apt to be subconsciously influenced by natural instincts which are equally apt to be subconsciously sensed by such children as are her constant companions—and this is another reason for not entrusting chil-

dren who are beginning to have sexual sensations to nurses or governesses. I am certain that a boy needs the example and influence of a man after he is about 8 years of age. Even if his mother be a very clever woman, and the "man" be rather a stupid one, the boy instinctively feels that such advice and exhortation as he may receive from a woman is pure theorising, but, when it comes from a man, it is the outcome of solid experience.

There are other reasons why children should be sent to boarding-schools after they have attained about 8 years of age :—

- a. On the principle of "Like to Like" and "Birds of a feather . . . ,", small children need the constant companionship of many others of their own age; but with the small families, which are the rule in the better-off classes, this companionship is not usually obtainable.
- b. We adults have all been through a tremendous strain, and, for most of us, our anxieties still continue. These troubles have persisted so long that we are not so acutely aware of them as we used to be; nevertheless, we *are* filled with anxieties, and children are quick to sense them, which accounts for the large number of "nervous" "highly strung," "super-sensitive" and emotional children who are so common now.

c. In former times, when families were larger, children had more companions of their own age, and inexperienced parents could easily obtain the advice of more experienced parents, which is not the case in these days of very small families. Parents had more experience of bringing up children, and had more time to devote to them.\* They are now less able or less willing to supervise their children and often place them in charge of the "ignorant women" of whom Dr. Maria Montessori speaks. (See p. 36). I have had numbers of "delicate" or "nervy" children under my charge, and I often receive long and detailed instructions as to their treatment, but I invariably find that all this delicacy and super-sensitiveness quickly disappears at school. I could cite astonishing cases of abnormal boys who have quickly become both happy and healthy on being sent to school.

Finally, I maintain that, though a child may be born great, noble, wealthy, clever, healthy, etc., there is one thing which it is not born to—and that is happiness. I thoroughly endorse the saying that "*God has*

\* Before the war mothers used to teach their children fairy stories, nursery rhymes, and general knowledge (including some religious knowledge). Nowadays, however, little children seem to know little or nothing of these things and to have missed that first seven years at a good mother's knee which have made the sterling men and women of the past.

*willed that human happiness should be, not an accident, but a moral achievement."* As that delightful personality and writer, Colonel Philip Trevor, C.B.E., says in "Rugby Union Football":—"I stoutly affirm that no standard of good is natural and, whether your babe be born in the castle or the cot, . . . you have to teach him . . . a sense of moral obligation. . . . The collective opinion of women who are friends and contemporaries of mine . . . (is) that the sense of moral obligation is higher in their boys than it is in their girls. The inference is obvious, and I think that these mothers accept it. The necessity for moral obligation is more strongly impressed upon boys in schools than it is upon girls in schools, and the penalties for offending against it are infinitely higher at the former than they are at the latter. You see, the thing has to be taught and, much as I regret to say it, the home teaching in this particular matter is insufficient."

- IV. Re "Note 4": "He had never chosen a suit of clothes without consulting his mother." Mothers who insist upon "mothering" their boys after they are about 8 years of age, prevent their boys from attaining manliness and self-realisation, and their action thus directly conduces to the production of the masturbator.
- V. Re "Note 5": "if the father shows himself to be harsh . . . (or) the boy himself comes

into collision with the father's injustice . . . ”  
I humbly endorse this statement.

- VI. Re “ Note 6 ” : “ if you let yourselves become mere crammers . . . if you let character go in working for a scholastic end, you are doing a great wrong ” : Schoolmasters who are guilty of these practices are not only “ keeping a boy from *realising himself*,” but they are forcing their victims to an effort from which they never really recover. (See “ Overworking Children,” p. 36).

## “ THE ANALYTICAL ASPECT OF THE SEX PROBLEM AMONG BOYS.”—PART. I.

### PREVENTIVES AND PALLIATIVES.

- I. “ The first great principle essential to success in coping with this problem is an atmosphere of absolute friendliness and sincerity.\* The child is confronted with sexual problems from two sources—his physical experience and his observation of life.

“ *He begins far earlier than most of us imagine* † to have physical sensations of a kind he cannot explain. Then, too, some day he begins to wonder where the baby sister came from.”

\* I agree with all my heart.

† I am sure that very many parents live “ in a fool's paradise ” on this subject. Note the four months baby already mentioned.

- II. "We have also to bear in mind that a great deal of harm can be done by offering solutions of problems that have not yet formulated themselves in the child's mind. It follows therefore that formal teaching, which offers to each child explanations of the same difficulties at the same age, cannot meet the requirements of the case and is foredoomed to failure."
- III. "We must therefore aim at producing an environment in which two things happen :
- a. A wholesome stimulation of curiosity with regard to sex physiology, and
  - b. An absence of any sense of restraint in the asking of questions from teachers or parents, coupled with confidence that no disapproval or deception will be encountered.
- IV. "I am perfectly aware that many parents and teachers believe that it is unnecessary to stimulate curiosity if the frank and friendly atmosphere exists, but it is desirable that the boy should have a fair grasp of sex physiology in animals, at any rate, before he himself comes consciously to experience desire ; that he may, in fact, obtain an objective outlook on sex, before the subjective side confronts him. In my opinion that is the correct way to forewarn, and therefore to forearm a boy. Let every boy keep pets : white mice are better than nothing, but rabbits and poultry are much better. At school this should be run collectively, so that there is quite open talk between



the boys and masters about a doe kindling, or eggs being fertilised, and so on. If sex knowledge begins in this way, the whole subject should be saved from that dreadful atmosphere of emotional morbidity and fatuous obscurantism."

- V. "As to the asking of questions; the child is in the presence of a great mystery—to some this mystery presents itself in a menacing way, in others there is no fear or shrinking. "Our answers must fit the questioner every time. The imperative necessity which the master feels for dealing with the question of masturbation is a sure indication of the complete failure of his own attempts—if any—to prepare his boys in the right way for the strain of temptation."
- VI. "Many of the more serious psychoneuroses date back to confirmation, when a well-meaning head-master adjured the terrified confirmation and to overcome his temptation to self-abuse on the ground that it might later be the cause of insanity or impotence."
- VII. "As to hours of sleep; individual requirements vary greatly. But the hours—or minutes—in bed that are not absolutely necessary for sleep are the hours in which the temptation to self-abuse is strongest."

#### COMMENTS—PART I.

- I. Re Section IV. "At schools this should be run collectively . . ." I thoroughly agree, but there are two objections :

- a. Some parents object and, if “there is quite open talk between boys and masters . . .” the boys of these parents must necessarily become acquainted with subjects to which their parents take exception.
- b. A boy who has been encouraged to talk quite openly before proceeding to a public-school is very likely to communicate his knowledge in all innocence to his comrades in spite of all warnings to the contrary. I know of one boy who did so and was overheard. The house-master sent for the father and accused the son of making “obscene” communications to other boys.

II. Re Section V. “The imperative necessity which the master feels, etc.”—See comment above. Also what chance has a master had “to prepare his” *new* “boys in the right way for the strain of temptation”? You do not find boys at a *good* preparatory school taking up the habit of self-abuse—they come already infected!

III. Re Section VI. “A well-meaning head-master adjured the terrified confirmand, etc.” To which I may add the teaching of some well-meaning “Christian” that an angry and outraged Deity is only awaiting the psychological moment to mete out punishment for this—one of “the seven *deadly* sins”! The child grows into a man retaining always at the back of his mind the feeling that the “Judgment of God” is hanging over his

head like a sword of Damocles, whose fall may be delayed but is inevitable.

IV. Re Section VII. "As to the hours of sleep ; individuals vary greatly" : It is the business of those who have care of children to discover just how long a child can sleep, and to arrange the dormitories by this consideration rather than merely by age, so that the children in various dormitories—which should go to bed at different times—shall sleep the whole time from "lights out" in each particular dormitory till "rise" next morning (which must be the same hour for all).

So far I have spoken only of boys, but competent observers assure me that, though there is perhaps as much lascivious talk among girls, there is far less self-abuse up to the age of adolescence. In explanation of which fact I offer the following suggestions :

1. The boy's organs of generation are external and are, therefore, more liable to be rubbed and irritated by clothing, etc.

2. Some mothers are given to kissing the "private parts" of their boy babies out of some sort of pride in having brought a man child into the world. This tends to set up sexual excitement.

3. Some nurses are given to stilling a querulous boy baby by playing with his penis.

4. Some women will deliberately excite the male organ to erection to give themselves those sensa-

tions which some folk derive from the perusal of obscene literature.

Finally, I would submit that those who have the charge of children, have the highest of all human offices to discharge. The physician has the care of the body, the priest has the cure of souls ; but parents, governesses, school-mistresses and school-masters have in charge the complete human being—body, mind and soul—at the most impressionable time of life. And I must say this of the school-masters and schoolmistresses I have known that, in almost all cases, they have discharged their sacred office to the best of their abilities. Many of them may have entered upon their profession without much, if any, effort to acquire the necessary knowledge and experience beforehand, and may pursue it without a sufficient sympathy ; there are many who shut their eyes to sexual matters ; and there are some who look upon their schools as a business from which their first consideration is to make sure of an income commensurate with the capital invested and their own estimate of their competence and labours. But, comparing them with people of other professions, one must needs admire the altruism, unselfishness and devotion to their charges which distinguishes the fraternity I have lately had the honour to join—and this is an opinion which I had formed long before I ever dreamed of joining it. If children are sometimes stinted at school, I would point out that a child costs as much to train at school whether the fees you pay be £120 per annum or twice that sum, and you must expect your children to be treated

accordingly. No sensible person would walk into a restaurant where the price of lunch is clearly marked at half-a-crown and expect to get a luncheon worth half-a-sovereign. Yet many parents who enter their boys for public schools where the fees vary from £180 to £240 per annum will drive the Preparatory School Masters to accept much smaller fees and expect that their children should want for nothing: to the honour of Principals of private schools be it said that such parents are not often disappointed.

### THE CHILD.

“God created man in his own image.” (Genesis I., 27).

Now that we have discussed certain evils to which children are liable, it is time to study the child itself, for only thus can we hope to discover, not merely palliatives, but cures. The child we know is an immature human being, but I honestly believe that “Man know thyself” is at least as insoluble a problem as it is ancient. Yet we can effect nothing with a child unless we can understand it. Fortunately, a child is almost always frank and trustful, and “of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.” Now there is one absolutely indispensable quality to be required of those who have charge of children, and that is sympathy. This word is derived from *sun* and *pathos*, “with” and “suffering,” and means the ability to suffer with another. Unless you can always see with your pupil’s eyes and follow all the workings of

its mind, you can never hope to be fully successful in his or her training.

We have to deal, first with children in general, and then with the individual in particular. As to children: we believe that "God created man in His own image." Now, what exactly is the force of the word "image"—or rather, of the original, which has been translated many times and, possibly, mis-translated sometimes? -

I always deprecate taking the statements in the Bible too literally. I, for one, would not ask anybody to believe that God—Who is a Spirit—exists in the likeness of man's *physical* form. It is the insistence upon the literal acceptance of *all* the statements in Holy Writ which exposes us to the taunts of unbelievers. The Jews were an Eastern people and Oriental Scriptures are full of imagery and parables, and the danger of taking every statement in the Bible *au pied de la lettre* is that it must infallibly expose us to the unanswerable criticism of the scoffer and the unbeliever.

My belief is rather that man resembles God in some of His manifestations—"In Him was life; and the life was the light of men. That was the true light, which lighteth every man which cometh into the world." In no point does a good man resemble God so strongly as in the example—the "light"—that he unconsciously holds up to those around him. He is as a light-house to his neighbours—a very "light of men." And it is the business of all those who have the charge of children to endeavour to develop in them to the

utmost this light "which lighteth every man."

Now, light at its purest and brightest is also whitest, and white is the presence of all colours, which, after all, are only three—red, yellow, blue. And man resembles light in this respect, that he too is composed of three elements—the body, the mind, and the spirit. These elements may be *studied* in water-tight compartments but, in the actual being, are so intimately blended and welded together, as are the three primary colours in light, that not one of them can be affected without its reaction upon the other two as well as upon the whole unity. And this "whole unity" will be capable of almost anything from very good to very bad in accordance with the equal or unequal development of the three sides of its nature.

It is, therefore, our business to seek the harmonious development of all three sides of our charges' natures, and two instances will suffice to prove that the insufficient development of any one of these elements must produce a deformity if not a monster.

We had in Napoleon a man of immense physical vigour and mental power, but he was carnal, cruel and utterly selfish. Physically and, still more, mentally he towers above the obscurer members of the human race, but his deficient spirituality made him a monster or an ogre.

Nelson's achievements in war suffice to prove his intellectual pre-eminence; and his child-like devotion to God, his habit of invoking the Divine aid and of submitting to the Divine will, prove him to have been a man of the highest spirituality,

Yet there was the Lady Hamilton episode in his life, which, to my mind, is only to be explained by the frailty of his physical form and the sufferings to which it was ceaselessly subjected. Had Nelson been physically strong, there would have been no Lady Hamilton in his life.

It is, therefore, my first point that we shall not have any real success in the training of children unless we thoroughly understand them and can create around them the conditions in which all three sides of their nature shall thrive vigorously and *equally*.

We may conclude, therefore, that while it is necessary for us to make a profound study of the care and management of children, and to do our best in their intellectual training within the compass of the curricula imposed upon us by the examinations for which we must train them, we should foster their spirituality — the development of “character” — by creating the conditions which are the most favourable to its growth. This, I maintain, should be the chiefest aim of true Education and the best cure as well as the best preventive of all those moral ills that flesh is heir to.

### PHYSICAL.

#### MENS SANA IN CORPORE SANO.

I believe that, taking men in the mass, the “sound body” is the postulate of the “sound mind” (intellect and spirit).

Dr. Cyril Burt has said: “The study of juve-



nile delinquency shows in the most unexpected directions the influence of physique upon character. Anything that weakens physical health tends to weaken self-control. Anything that conduces to physical irritation tends to set up a mood of mental irritability. With those who are sub-normal intellectually the efficacy of simple physical remedies is quite as striking as with those who are sub-normal in character or temperament. The provision of spectacles, the extraction of teeth, the extirpation of tonsils and adenoid growths, have often converted an alleged mental defective into a normal or nearly normal child.

. . . A man is something more than a carcass loosely coupled with a ghost. *Material and spiritual are reciprocally involved, and the two together are to be treated as inseparable aspects of one highly complex whole.*"

We may therefore turn our attention first to the development of the sound body. We need not discuss the questions of locality and climate, soil and grounds, sanitation and ventilation, accommodation and clothing, lighting and heating, feeding and exercise, care and management, and a host of other items, for there are already many excellent works on these subjects. We need only consider certain points which are too often unknown or ignored.

#### CARE AND MANAGEMENT.

The great majority of parents seem to assume that a Degree is a sufficient qualification for the

care of children. Now, we know that people who attempt to keep animals for profit without careful previous study and *considerable experience* of their care and management, are fore-doomed to failure. I wonder how many people have come to grief over poultry-farming alone simply because they started without adequate knowledge and experience—"their name is Legion"! Experts know that unless young animals are kept under conditions of perfect cleanliness, comfort, and peace of mind, their development must suffer—they know, for instance, that, if young stock are frightened, they will not fatten for the table. Yet very few parents ever enquire into one's knowledge of the laws of health which one ought to promote in their children or of the battle of life for which one is expected to prepare them.

#### FOOD.

Re Food : Good food is one of the chief essentials in the development of the "sound body"; but "good food" means the right kind of food-materials, in proper proportions and quantities, *prepared by a good cook*—for the best of food can be spoilt by indifferent cooking.

The question of diet has exercised scientists for some time past. It was at first thought that the more you ate, the better. Then it was discovered that food-stuffs consisted of proteins, fats, carbohydrates, and mineral salts, each of which had its value in Calories.\* Now, the body is like an

\* A Calorie is the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of one centigramme of water through 1° C.

engine, which derives its power from a furnace. The food provides the fuel, which is oxidised or consumed and is turned into bodily warmth and energies. These energies are wholly derived from food consumed and, therefore, the amount and nature of one's food was determined by Calories up to 10 years ago.

It was then discovered that artificial foods fed to animals in the exact amount and proportions indicated by theory, led to death, not life; and further researches appeared to reveal the existence of other substances, which were named Vitamines, as necessary to health.

Whatever may be the ultimate verdict of science as to calories, vitamines, etc., it is certain that most artificial foods, highly milled cereal products, muscle meat, potatoes, and sugar are insufficient by themselves to maintain animals in health. In fact, the best way to obtain the necessary food factors is to eat a "well-planned diet"—sufficient animal fat (fat of meat, butter, dripping, lard, suet, etc.), *brown* bread, fresh vegetables (including water-cress and salads), fresh fruit, a liberal helping of cooked green vegetables once a day, \* the equivalent of a quart of milk (as milk and as milk products), and the occasional substitution of liver, kidneys, heart, calf's head, brains, sweet-bread, and such like, for the "joint."

\* Cooked green vegetables, including cabbages, should be steamed and then only for the shortest possible time.

## DELETERIOUS FOODS.

It is not, however, only what children should eat, but what they should not eat that demands attention. At a National Milk Conference convened on 21. 11. 23. it was confessed that "pasteurised milk, as commercially produced in this country, was often 'infective' milk. Realising the value of milk, especially to the young, it was to be regretted that the consumption per head per day was only about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a pint, while in the United States it was at least three times as great. . . . Expansion of milk production, however, could be of no avail in promoting health unless the hygienic quality of milk could be perfected."

Sir Frederick Treves had pointed out that the increase in cancer in recent years has been exactly co-incidental with the introduction of preserved foods. Many physiologists have long been puzzled by an increase in other diseases and, in searching for causes, they have come to look on food preservatives with suspicion. It is admitted that nothing has been proved, but there is a feeling that the something wrong may well be connected with the change in the character of the food supplies of the country. On 20.9.23. Mr. Otto Hehner, the eminent analyst, wrote to the *Times* that during the last 50 years a profound change has come over our food supply. Formerly food material came more or less direct from the farm to the kitchen; now a very large proportion of it passes through the factories. This change has been accompanied by the introduction of a

large number of insidious poisons—their quantity in each food article is so minute that positive and obvious injury is out of the question, but *their cumulative effect in the course of years is bound to become visible. . . . No organism can stand it indefinitely.*

The obvious remedy is to supply your kitchen as far as possible direct from your own fowls, dairy, vegetable - garden, etc., and to avoid all food-stuffs which have been treated with preservatives.

#### NATURE THE HEALER.

It was already known that children who were fed on insufficient or unsuitable food developed rickets, but could be restored if fed with cod-liver oil. It happened, however, that Dr. Pirquet, of Vienna, collected 100 unwanted babies and lodged them in a handsome, bright hospital where 50 Pirquet babies were fed on his restricted ration and the other 50, the Lister Unit babies, had the “extras” of full milk and cod-liver oil. The experiment began in the bright days of spring and went on through six months of summer—at the end of the time there was nothing to choose between them. Winter then set in and now, in the absence of sunlight, the Pirquet babies began to exhibit the signs of rickets. This demonstrated the fact that rickets may be caused by deficient diet, but can be neutralised by plenty of sunlight. It was further found that, when babies with symptoms of rickets were brought to Pirquet’s clinique, they rallied if ultra-violet rays were

turned on to them, and, even in winter, could do without the extra ration. Thus it is proved that, if a population becomes stunted and rickety, it is due partly to deficient or unsuitable food, but *chiefly to deficient sunlight* ! (Observer.'')

Sir Henry Gauvain has proved in the Treloar Convalescent Home at Alton that children apparently hopelessly crippled can be cured by the gradual reduction of clothing and exposure of the body to sunlight out of doors. A sunlit room has not the same effect as direct sunshine, since glass cuts off the curative ultra-violet rays. The cooling power of air is in itself valuable, for it provokes the body to keep itself warm by burning up its fuel to provide heat. Disease is often caused by the fermentation of unused food, and immunity from such disease is obtained by the exercise which causes it to be used. It has been found that men in overheated rooms and factories cannot produce their best work, and, also, become discontented ; the sun-school child can be educated better because his mentality is higher. The whole science of clothing needs to be reconsidered. Clothes by day and bed-clothes by night should be the least that is sufficient for health. Immense harm is caused by clothing children too warmly by day and by night—inasmuch as this reacts upon them physically, it must also react upon them intellectually and spiritually.

In 1908 Dr. Rollier opened the first clinic for the treatment of surgical tuberculosis by sunlight at Leysin, an Alpine village sheltered among fragrant pines ; and his records of 4,844 cases,

adults as well as children, during the 8 years, 1914-1921, show that 80.5 per cent. were healed, 11.5 per cent. improved, 6.5 per cent. were stationary, and only 1.5 per cent. were worse—the last were all complicated by other infections. Dr. Rollier has recently published “Heliotherapy,” and Sir Henry Gauvain, who contributes a fore-word, writes:—“Wherever the sun shines and the requisite skill exists for its utilisation, there insolation may be successfully employed. There is abundant sunshine in these islands, especially in the South of England. Manifestly this work has a moral for all who desire to make the world safer for childhood. Healing is from the skies.” (*Times*, 2. 4. 23.) It should be noted that sunlight and fresh air, especially in places “sheltered among fragrant pines,” are not only curative of *all* weaknesses but also protective against them.

The medical correspondent of the *Observer* wrote on 6.5.23:—“It is an astonishing fact that I am not yet able to name any private practitioners in this country who carry out Dr. Rollier’s treatment, though there are several places where the sun is used by non-qualified persons, but such data as I have before me suggest that these practitioners have not acquainted themselves with the findings of science. The sun-cure methods are not fool-proof, but intelligent and careful persons, reading Rollier’s ‘Heliotherapy’ and using their common-sense, can assuredly practise the sun cure for convalescent and ‘delicate’ children. They can also modify their clothing on the lines indicated.”

Professor Leonard Hill has said that men live long who live in the open air, and the expectation of life for girls of 15 in Surrey was 9 years longer than in Oldham. Hot, moist air lowers the defensive mechanism; the air should be cold, dry, and free from dust. Children should breathe cold air, sleep with their windows open, and deepen breathing by open-air exercise. Dust is particularly harmful.

#### TEETH.

On 12.1.23 was published the first report of the Committee for the Investigation of the Causes of Dental Disease, appointed by the Medical Research Council. It is by Mr. Howard Mummery, and should be in the hands of all who have the care of children. (Special Report Series, No. 70, Stationary Office, 2s. net.)

It emphasises the power of the teeth to heal themselves, and the power is assisted by keeping the mouth clean. Many children with badly neglected mouths who were treated at the Royal Dental Hospital showed so much softening of the enamel of the crowns of the molars that it flaked off on being touched. Yet when these mouths were rendered healthy, the teeth became quite hard, polished, and useful chewers. The inculcation into the minds of children of the doctrine "take care of your teeth" has, therefore, the merit of being scientific as well as sanitary.—(*Times*.)

#### SLEEP.

"It is difficult to determine how much sleep a



child requires. Efforts, however, have been made to arrive at some kind of exactitude, the best known of these being the figures of Dr. Clement Dukes. These are . . . seven to eight, 12½ hours; eight to nine, 12 hours; nine to ten, 11½ hours; ten to fifteen, 11 hours. . . . Dr. Malcolm Gross . . . found that notably 'bright' children increased in number with the increase in hours of sleep . . . there were no bright children when the hours of sleep fell much below the average." ("Times," 10. 5. 22.)

#### RHEUMATISM.

"The enormous prevalence of heart trouble among children was referred to at a recent discussion of the Medical Officers of Schools' Association. Generally speaking the idea prevailed that in 'rheumatism'—the 'mother of heart disease'—we have a plague not less deadly than tuberculosis. Certain it is that heart disease is now 'the largest single cause of mortality in this country.' . . . The evidence that the 'rheumatic' poison exerts a powerful influence on nervous tissue and also on the heart is overwhelming. Very possibly its evil effects are to be found in the realm of nervous as well as of cardiac disease." ("Times," 3. 7. 22.)

#### RECREATION.

At a meeting of the National Union of Women Teachers held in London on 11. 10. 23. Miss Susie Lee argued that dancing was a child's natural form

of expression, and she found that many cases of extreme nervousness in children were cured by liberating the power of expression through dancing. I may add my experience that almost anything—dancing, music, drawing, acting, games—which tends to promote a child's joy of life, also tends to promote a happy, healthy, and well-balanced character.

### INTELLECTUAL.

#### EDUCATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD.

Education (in its narrow sense of book-learning) has come to interest the public to-day as it never has done before, and recent legislation has inaugurated a new era in learning. It therefore behoves parents to realise that their children will have to compete with all comers of both sexes, and to provide their children with education on modern lines *from an early age*.

“Not only is early childhood the chief danger-period in respect of physical health and development—in matters of mind and spirit also it is the preventive age.\* In early childhood lies the secret of racial and human betterment. Much of our present day education of older boys and girls is in a sense a remedial measure, aimed at ills we have allowed to develop by allowing children to pass through the formative period of their lives in a state of neglect. This task (education in early childhood) cannot be given into inexperienced hands.

\* This is the “Mother Phase”—the most important phase.

The idea of handing over the smallest children to untrained and ignorant women is the old idea of the 'crèche,' anterior even to Froebel." (Dr. Maria Montessori in the "Times," of 23. 6. 1922.)

Mr. Julian Dadd says, "The psychic life of each new entrant into the World progresses by gradual stages from the chaotic, egotistic, purely instinctive infantile state to the comparative rationality of adult manhood. . . . A partial and unconscious recognition of this seems to have been implicit in our method of treating children. We have regarded the child at different stages of his career as being more or less a primitive being, and have dealt with him accordingly. Unreasoning submission to authority and not infrequent subjection to personal violence have been continually exacted from the growing members of our infant community." (Prep. Schs. Review, November, 1923.)

Exactly so: this is not developing character by leading out something from within—it is killing character by forcing in something from without and making children all of one pattern.

#### OVERWORKING CHILDREN.

"Sir Maurice Craig said: 'A happy childhood was essential to a well-balanced adult life. It was the psychological atmosphere of the home and the school\* which was the foundation of success in

\* As the *Times Educational Supplement* once remarked, "The school is powerless without the co-operation of the home." I do not think the school is actually "powerless" unless the

after life far more than any scholarship; intelligence should be the aim of education rather than learning. There were risks in early brilliancy in children. Orderliness of mind was all-important; the mind dominated by emotion tended to be 'sloppy' and unstable." ("Times," 24.4.21.)

"The Paris Academy of Medicine actually blessed 'inattention' as a gift of nature whereby children might escape from a régime less healthy than that of prisoners. 'Happily,' says this Journal, 'the child has a wonderful gift of inattention which allows him to shake himself free from all intellectual harness. He is believed to be in the class, but he is playing truant. His imagination laughs at regulations which impose the double torture of silence and immobility. Inhibition is his intellectual defence.'

"Most doctors now think that school children are overworked. This applies especially to the 'clever' child, that unfortunate being who seems to possess a special power of passing examinations, and so bringing credit on his or her school. Sir Frederick Mott, in his recent lectures, has, incidentally, called attention to the harm which may be done by exploiting the unstable brilliance of precocious children. But even children who are quite normal are frequently compelled to carry on sustained intellectual efforts from an early hour

home is actually hostile or obstructive; but I am sure that the school is much more quickly and effectively successful when it is accorded the sincere "co-operation of the home."

in the morning until late at night—if home-lessons or ‘preparation’ are taken into consideration.

“The school child is a beginner, and is studying subjects most of which possess but small interest for him. Thus he must add to his other labours the very great labour of attention — which is refused by his elders even to their amusements, if they fail to amuse greatly. In the circumstances our English childhood is probably not less indebted than French childhood to the gift of ‘blessed and salutary idleness.’ ” (“Times,” 20. 3. 22.)

“It is the opinion of competent observers that bright boys are too often victimised to make an honours sheet, and that stupid boys, who escape this trouble, frequently achieve a much greater degree of success in after-life. The probability would seem to be that normal children’s brains are not fit to take in the kind of mental food usually supplied to them. The bright boys are, perhaps, not quite normal. Thus, the so-called stupid school-boy is really the ‘father of the man.’ Long after his ‘brilliant’ class-mate has been ‘worked out,’ he maintains his intellectual vigour. In that sense modern boys may well pray for the gift of stupidity.” (“Times,” 21. 3. 22.)

“In distributing the prizes at Christ College, Blackheath, Lord Justice Scrutton consoled the boys who had not been the recipients of these marks of distinction that there were four judges in the highest places of the English Bench who had never received a prize when at school, and were generally at the bottom of their class. They were now, he added, among the most trusted of our

judges, and he drew the moral of the school prodigy often failing in the struggle of life, while the 'dunce of the class' came to the front.

"These words are most true. Some time ago an inquiry was instituted as to what became of school prodigies, and it must be confessed that the result of the investigation indicated that the 'great flood of mind' in youth was by some mysterious law of compensation followed by a species of intellectual drought which sterilised everything. It must, of course, be admitted that John Stuart Mill, for instance, at an age when it is usual to go to school, had mastered as much Greek and Latin as most boys know when they are leaving it, and he produced his great works long afterwards; and that Lord Kelvin, who gave the most marvellous applications of the laws of Nature to the uses of humanity, was when twelve years old occupied with problems which were engaging his attention at the time of his death. But such men as Mill and Kelvin may be taken as exceptions to the rule.

"No one would deny the claim of Sir Isaac Newton to a monument in Westminster Abbey. Yet the discoverer of the universal law of gravitation was at school described as a dunce. Another Isaac, who stands as one of a great triumvirate of the Church of England with Taylor and Hooker, and who as a mathematician has been ranked second only to Newton, is Isaac Barrow, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose father once said that 'if God takes away any of my children I trust it will be Isaac, as I fear he will never be fit for anything

in this world.' Ludwig the famous geometrician, was sent away from school after four years' ineffectual struggle to learn the common rules of arithmetic. Hume, who is described by Huxley as an 'intellectual athlete,' was in boyhood said by his parents to be 'uncommon wake minded.' Gibbon, the author of the 'Decline and Fall,' was pronounced 'dreadfully dull.' Glorious John Dryden, the greatest of English satirists, was accounted a great 'num-skull.' Goldsmith's fame was grafted on to a boyhood of wholly unrecognised capabilities. Scott was denounced as 'the boy that has the thickest skull in the school.' Napoleon was esteemed at best a plodder. The Duke of Wellington was in youth supposed to be hopelessly deficient in mental ability.

"The failure to discover and develop potential cleverness or genius is often said to be due to our educational methods, which have generally loaded the memory, rather than made claims on thought and imagination. It is much more easy to state the difficulty inherent in our educational system than to find a remedy for it. Perhaps the best that can be expected of the schools is that they may form character and impress on the rising generation that application and steadfastness of purpose are, as Lord Justice Scrutton showed, indispensable conditions of success in life."

("Times," 25.7.22.)

#### BOYS' AND GIRLS' EDUCATION.

The Report of the Consultative Committee on Differentiation of the Curriculum for boys and

girls, respectively, in Secondary Schools was published on 19th January, 1928.

The report says: "Our inquiry has not imbued us with any conviction that there are clear and ascertained differences between the two sexes on which an educational policy may readily be based. . . . It would be fatal, at the present juncture, to prescribe one curriculum for boys and another for girls . . . we are convinced that, given the same conditions, girls can match the achievements of boys. *But the conditions of health are not the same* . . . . The increasing esprit de corps in school life, and the growing tendency to organise and emphasise all school activities . . . stand in need of criticism and control, more particularly in girls' schools. The standard of conscientious performance of duty was never higher among teachers, but this very conscientiousness may involve risks for the taught . . . it may check what it is meant to foster—the full and free development of individual initiative and vigour . . . most witnesses thought that the general conscientiousness of girls extended also to their sports, and that there was a danger that some pupils, who were over conscientious and docile, might exhaust themselves physically and mentally for the supposed good of the school . . . special care is required in organising games for girls in day schools, and more especially in co-educational day schools. The pupils frequently come from long distances. . . . The games require, therefore, to be watched with care, and due regard should be paid to the previous strain which had been undergone by the girls.



. . . Our physiological evidence indicates that girls are, on the whole, more liable to physical and mental fatigue than boys. 'This may be due, not only to the larger reserve of strength possessed by a boy, but also to his greater power of resisting pressure. It is well known that most boys have a habit of 'healthy idleness,' and are thus able to protect themselves from over-pressure, whereas girls are more amenable to authority and more industrious . . . we recommend that . . . there should be greater freedom in the curriculum in boys' and girls' schools; that time-tables should be modified to allow boys and girls more free time in which to develop their own individual interests . . . more attention should be devoted by parents, headmistresses and school-doctors to the possibility of taking suitable precautions for the protection of girls against fatigue and nervous overstrain . . . "

#### PARENTS AND TEACHERS.

It is far from my intention to argue that children should be allowed to idle, least of all during school-hours—"Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." What I *do* say is that children should be induced, not forced, to work *hard* at suitable subjects, but must not be *over-worked*.

All this "get clever quickly" is doing immense harm to children intellectually — and, therefore, physically and spiritually. The fault lies as much with parents who press teachers for material results as with teachers who are unsuited to their

profession, especially when they are lacking in sympathy and spirituality.

As the "Times" Educational Supplement of 20. 10. 23. remarks, "Teaching has been described as a form of middle-class casual labour. It is one of the few avenues to a livelihood which can be entered by anybody who has had no kind of preliminary technical training such as would be demanded from a doctor, solicitor, accountant, typist, nurse or auctioneer . . . not even a 'good degree in honours' is any proof whatever of ability to impart knowledge, and still less of any ability to care for the souls and bodies of their pupils. It must be admitted also that, even where teachers have been trained for their work, there has been little or no inquiry into the intellectual or spiritual fitness of those who take the course. The truth is that no training course can create such proficiency, at best it can only equip the beginner with the rudiments of teaching certain forms of knowledge."

"The new Elementary School of Germany is an interesting example of methods being discarded by the country which evolved them while foreign countries still cling to that which they adopted at second hand. In the Saxon Education Ministry Laws for Elementary Schools, issued in 1919, the aim of the Volksschule is given as follows:—'The development of the child through exercise of its bodily and mental powers, so that it will be capable of taking its part later in the service of the community . . . the school should be a living community, in which the child has a living relation

to the same problems that the bigger community of adults has . . . the parents, moreover, become, as it were, a part of the school\* . . . in the old schools co-operation in work was not allowed . . . in the new education for social service we look upon co-work as a necessity . . . the relationship between teacher and pupil is a new relationship for Germany: the teacher is a friend and guide, and his chief aim is to get the confidence of his pupils. . . . His guidance must rest on the knowledge of child nature, and especially on the belief that the child is born good.' "

All this is a wonderful advance, in theory at all events, on what has hitherto obtained in Germany. We have copied former German methods fairly closely and, though the natural common-sense and kindliness of the English character has made our teachers less wooden and unsympathetic than the German pedagogue, there are still some of whom we cannot say that their "chief aim is to get the confidence of their pupils," to be their "friend and guide," to acquire a "knowledge of child nature" or to believe that "the child is born good"; and it is not at every school that *the united efforts of the whole staff are concentrated on the creation of an atmosphere of robust spirituality*, through which alone the highest and best results can be obtained.

\* I have already quoted the *Times Educational Supplement*, "The school is powerless without the co-operation of the home."

## THE TRUE AIM OF INTELLECTUAL TRAINING.

My numerous business friends complain that the young Briton is ignorant, has a distaste for learning, and is wanting in application; and they seem to think it is "the nature of the beast." We read that German merchants were heartily opposed to war because the superior industry of their employés was fast giving them all they wanted and more than they could get by fighting for it. But I submit that our Empire is there to prove that the young Briton is, *by nature*, superior to all his rivals—and I venture to suggest that the fault has lain rather with the teachers and their teaching than with the taught.

In December, 1916, the "Joint Standing Committee of the Head Masters' Conference and Association of Preparatory Schools" submitted a "Report on the Curriculum of the Preparatory Schools" which said:—"It is quite certain that in a number of Preparatory Schools the education of the majority of the boys is sacrificed in order that a few may reach a high standard in those particular subjects (Classics?) which are of decisive importance in the awarding of Scholarships at some Public Schools."

I have always urged the necessity of making English *the* most important subject in the education of *small* children, and, as I have lived my life in the world of men, I may be expected to take a purely "practical" view of education and to agree with those many parents who demand that their boys should be trained for a merely material prize.

But I am profoundly convinced that to insist on too materialistic an education is to cut out of life all those humanising influences which make life worth living—it is not wise *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*.

I venture humbly to agree with Mr. Coolidge, the President of the United States, who said that “the world of to-day is absolutely dependent on science and commerce, and we must not depreciate technical and physical education, but we must mark its limits. We must use it and direct it, rather than be used and directed by it; that it may be as it should be, not the master, but the servant, that the physical forces may not prevail over the moral forces, and that the rule of life may be righteousness, not expediency. Most modern education is superficial, and teachings devoted exclusively to commercialism are insufficient: we have need of ideals in life.”

I am sure that it is as much a mistake to neglect the classics as I am certain that it is wrong to elevate them into a fetish to the neglect of our mother tongue. There is need of the “humanities” in education; but I plead that true education should mean a great deal more than this. Education is not a mere matter of book learning and games taught in water-tight compartments. It is a matter of these and other things taught as a carefully thought-out whole complementing and supplementing each other, and inculcated much more by example than by precept — much more by the creation of an “atmosphere” than by any amount of injunction and exhortation. The true

object of education is to teach us "how to live," not "how to make a living."

Hence I submit that education should be conducted by leading forth something from within (*educere*) not by forcing in something from without; and that *all* our instruments of education should be constantly employed to develop the spiritual as much as the other sides of man's nature. The mere athlete may be simply a "muddled oaf," the mere student but a brutal materialist, and the mere saint only an unpractical idealist, if not a prig.

For this reason we should seek to impose a certain amount of responsibility upon even the smallest children. Every form, every dormitory, every game, and every department of activity at a school should have its own little "captain," besides the school prefects.\* Happy is the child who is placed in any position of responsibility and acts up to it; for this makes it reliable, sympathetic, and unselfish; it becomes its business to check unkindness, immorality, and indiscipline; and, in checking these faults in others, it learns to eliminate them from its own conduct and character. It is the finest thing in its whole education.

### SPIRITUAL.

#### CHARACTER MAKETH MAN.

"In war," said Napoleon, "character is of more importance than intelligence or education."

\* These, however, should not be invested with any powers of punishment for they necessarily lack discrimination.

Had he said "life" instead of "war," this saying would have been just as true and far more valuable for it should be obvious that whatever a man may have of genius, and however highly cultivated his genius may be, "character" alone will enable him to surmount all the obstacles which must stand between every man and success.

Now, character is a spiritual quality. It can be cultivated like any other human attribute, and should be the master of both mind and body by its ability to force them to carry out its will. The essential characteristic of a "character" which shall command and compel success, is iron resolution. Such was Napoleon's own "character" which, however, was carnal, cruel, and purely materialistic. Without "character" the noblest virtues may be unable to achieve anything, but, with character, vice and materialism may be made to triumph. Character, therefore, must be allied with high morality if it is to achieve the greatest amount of good—not evil.

Since the office of "character" is to surmount all obstacles by indomitable will-power, we do wrong when we subject children to "the sheltered life." On the contrary, we should see to it that they have asperities and obstacles to encounter, and we should teach them to surmount them in the right spirit.

Now, we must admit that the younger the child, the more does its physical side predominate. For this reason the earliest "asperities and obstacles" which we must provide for children to conquer should be physical: we should teach them games

like cricket and “rugger,” and *pari passu*, teach them to play in the spirit of “play up,” “stick it,” and “no game is ever lost till it is won,” as well as “it is not cricket,” “play the game,” “the game’s the thing.”

The ancient Greeks had grasped the value of games in developing character: Lucian’s “Apology of Gymnastics” emphasises the fact that athletic training directed the ambitions of young men towards worthy objects, diverted them from idleness and its consequent vices, and imbued them with that combination of good qualities which was known as “kalokagathia.” Among the Ionians, and conspicuously among the Athenians, the balanced and harmonious development of mind and body was the end especially desired; and it is not possible to miss the connection between this systematic culture of the tripartite nature of man and the perfectly astonishing pre-eminence of the ancient Greeks, \* and especially of the Athenians, in physical development, and, still more, in philosophy and art!

Let us always remember that the object of athletics should be spiritual as well as intellectual and physical; and that man’s education, like man’s nature, is a trinity in unity — *one* education in three parts of *one* being of three natures. Games have this one supreme advantage over all kinds of indoor work: they postulate contest and demand

\* “The Glory that was Greece,” belonged to a little country of only two and a half million people split into a number of petty and mutually hostile states. Yet, think what Ancient Greece, thus handicapped, achieved!



courage, and, as their principles are being constantly tested, they are less rule-ridden, and less conventional than the education of the class-room. The objection to athletics is that they may be turned into a show, and that more attention *may* be devoted to the more promising children, merely for show purposes, to the neglect of those who will never "do their school credit;" but the same objection applies to every activity which obtains at any school. The man or woman who crams and drives his or her more promising pupils in order that they may win scholarships as an advertisement for the school, is doing even more harm, because permanent harm, than the man who devotes the greater part of his attention to his more athletic pupils.

But the athletic exercises of Ancient Greece were not "team games," and, therefore, failed to teach the sacrifice of self for the good of others. In this and other respects some of our British sports are superior—let us see what two notable authorities have to say of them.

Says Mr Punch "The true sportsman is one who has not merely braced his muscles and developed his endurance by the exercise of some great sport, but has, in the pursuit of that exercise, learnt to control his anger, to be considerate to his fellow men, to take no mean advantage, to resent as a dishonour the very suspicion of trickery, to bear aloft a cheerful countenance under disappointment, and never to own himself defeated until the last breath is out of his body."

Bishop Welldon, in the "Cricketer," of Nov-

ember, 1922, says : " Sport is, or was, a synonym for honour. A sportsman was a man who would not, and could not, do a shabby act. The sporting spirit was the spirit of sensitive honour. To ' play the game ' was to do, and to do only, the upright thing. . . . Games, too, demand a temperate habit . . . in the sense of an ordered and disciplined life as a whole. ' He that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things.' - Such temperance is conduct which enriches human life."

We are often assured that our young men are not as well educated as those of France and Germany : whence then comes our pre-eminence in all the sterner activities of life, and how shall we explain that our empire is the greatest known to history ?

Did not a French jester break the news of a defeat to his royal master by declaring that those old-time Englishmen " were such fools that they did not know when they were beaten " ? Did not our Gallic allies in the Crimea say that the British were " lions led by asses " ? And, when things were going badly for us in the Great War, did not neutral writers warn our jubilant ill-wishers that " England loses many battles, but she always wins one—the last " ?

Tenacity may be an inherent characteristic of our race, but we know that all qualities atrophy if they are not used, and, since we have a natural abhorrence for martial exercises, to what shall we look but to our games to foster the spirit that wins through in life ? I, therefore, attach immense value to games taught on the right lines — it is

only necessary not to over-do them, and to have them “*clean.*” And, though I confess that our team-games cannot be pursued by all men and women, I submit that those who do play them unconsciously set up a standard of example of fortitude. I believe that games are indispensable to the development of a robust spirituality; but I own that, inasmuch as they teach *self-reliance*, they teach reliance on a thing which is a fallible thing. Every human being needs to learn and practise some great code of morals.

Now, we find that every great code of morals has been produced by some *religion*—a philosophy is too cold to give us the fire, the inspiration, the hope, the comfort, the “charity” which ennobles “character.” And it is to Christianity that we must turn because “by their fruits ye shall know them”: It is among Christian peoples that we find the greatest respect for law and liberty, person and property, women and children; the gospel of self-discipline, self-sacrifice, and self-abnegation; faith in an Infallible Saviour, hope when all is hopeless, and “charity” to all living creatures. Hence I conclude that the development of the highest type of character postulates the necessity for the adequate teaching of Christianity as an integral and fundamental part of our education of children.

Since Christianity teaches that “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength and thy neighbour as thyself—*this do and thou shalt live*”—and “if you love not your neighbour whom you have seen, how shall you love God whom you

have not seen," it is clear that the road to God is through man, and that it was the failure of the peoples of Europe to assimilate these principles that precipitated the terrible catastrophe of the Great War. We owe that unspeakable cataclysm to the fact that the rulers of Russia were debauched and corrupt, that the German children had been given an almost purely materialistic education, and knew not that it is righteousness alone which exalteth character, and that the governing classes of France had thrown out religion.

The sagacious British people has, so far, avoided the fatal extremes of religion without education (Russia) and education without religion (Germany and France), but we are now confronted with the danger that the heightened cost of living, and the aggravated struggle for existence may make us more apathetic to the vital necessity for religion in education or may even incline us to demand that our children shall be trained for purely material prizes.

As to the development of the noblest type of will-power, if we feel that an object is beyond our power of attainment, then we shall be unable to attain it by our own efforts; if, however, we are confident of success, we may achieve what to others is impossible. Freedom of will has been denied by many, even Christians, who insist that man's will is subordinate to the Divine Will. If, however, we hold that "with man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible," and that we have the power to achieve "all things" in co-operation with God, then, indeed, "faith can re-

move mountains." Will achieves its greatest freedom and its greatest success when we consciously and deliberately co-operate with the Divine Will. How often do we find someone who is a brilliant performer in some walk of life or at some sport, and who is also a shining exemplar of "the Spirit of the Game." His very brilliance is a sufficient proof that "the law" has done nothing to trammel the free exercise of his will-power. And so, too, may (and does) the human will triumph in life, although it is exercised in complete accordance with the Divine Will. Indeed, we may suggest that this very collaboration with the Divine Will endows man with so much of inspiration, confidence, and judgment, that he becomes able to transcend the bounds which would otherwise limit his achievements. Since God is Love, our will should also be perfect love.\* The student of the Gospels must have noted that Christ always acted by evoking man's latent will-power, which, however, He would not coerce. By evoking man's latent will-power He healed the sick and raised the dead; but "He could do no great work" where there was "unbelief" for He declined to compel the "heart" which was "hardened" against Him. He Himself was always out to do "the Will of the Father Which sent Me" and, if we could only be equally resolved to work with and through the Divine Will, we also

\* This is not the mawkish and maudlin emotion which some people mean by "love," but the "love" which impels a man to "lay down his life for his friend," even when that "friend" is a stranger and of a hostile race (cf. "The Good Samaritan.")

could achieve His mastery over “all things” as His disciples—the first recipients of the Holy Spirit—were able to emulate His works. It is in times of greatest helplessness and hopelessness that faith makes our will-power sufficient to save us, and herein lies the real truth of the saying, “Man’s extremity is God’s opportunity.”

It is on this principle that we should seek to train the child. “Any fool” can coerce a child into apparent and temporary good behaviour, but only by evoking its will-power to co-operate with the Divine Will shall we establish real and permanent virtue.

We all know that many people are undecided as to whether they are religious or not, while others have definitely discarded religious beliefs because they were unconvinced. Now, it is obvious that our spiritual outlook and grasp must be as much affected by previous training as is our intellectual knowledge or physical address. When we meet people who are apathetic or even agnostic, inquiry will almost always prove that such people have either lacked early training in religion, or have been taught so many patent absurdities in the name of religion that they are apt to suspect that the whole must be as mistaken as the parts which have proved to be untenable.

For this reason I have always deprecated the teaching of anything not in the Gospels : such teachings are always liable to be proved false as knowledge increases in the world. I almost as strongly deprecate the introduction of controversial subjects to the attention of *young* children, for this

necessarily teaches them that parts of Christ's message to man are disputed, which very fact may lead them to doubt just when we wish them to accept our teaching in perfect faith. Surely it is better for us teachers of young children, to adhere closely to the Gospels, and to leave it to the parents of our pupils to supplement this teaching in accordance with their own convictions ?

Of course, we must hold up Christ as the Perfect Example \* to be followed by all, but *only to the best of our abilities*. To teach that we must equal Christ, is to demand the impossible and breed despair. We should make it clear to all whom we teach that their gifts must differ, as in the Parable of the Talents, and that it is for each of us to make the best of what he has got.

A child who has never learned to "walk with God," that is to live its ordinary life as in the constant presence of God—with God in its heart as well as in all around it—is sure to grow up spiritually apathetic and to allow absorption in material things to blot out such spirituality as it may have possessed originally.

\* But we must get rid of the conception of an emaculate Christ, "gentle" to sickliness. We must, in fact, think and speak of Him as both perfectly godly man and manly God: one who deliberately rejected material power and preferred to march steadfastly and fearlessly to that crucifixion—the humiliating execution of a common criminal—which He had ever held up to Himself as the self-appointed end of His earthly career. Children are hero-worshippers and Christ was a hero no less than He was God—all the more heroic in that He preferred gentleness to violence.

All gifts which are unused must inevitably atrophy, and, therefore, if we leave the soul uncultivated, it will wither; and if we subordinate it to the lust of gain, it will surely die; and what might have led us to communion with God as part of our daily life, must inevitably lead us to apathy if not to spiritual death.

There are people who think that it is a mistake to educate a child in spiritual things because on growing up it would probably revolt from much it had learned, but all experience shows that the Jesuits were right when they said: "Give me your child till it is seven, and after that you can do what you like with it." Psychologists are at least agreed in this: All the lasting impressions of life are made in childhood. The reason why the adult revolts from much it has learned of many things, including religion, is due to the way in which these things have been presented to it in childhood. The way that a child is crammed with facts and dates in Holy Scripture—the Books of the Bible in their correct order, the exact dimensions of the Tabernacle, a meticulous knowledge of the wanderings of the Hebrews in the desert, the journeys of St. Paul, with dates, etc.—is calculated to disgust a child with "religion," and to cause the adult to revolt from a subject which was so lacking in "the spirit that quickeneth."

A child should be taught from the very first that it is born into the Kingdom of God. The only prayer Christ taught us begins "Our Father Which art in Heaven." If we acknowledge that we are all the children of one Father, and that our



Father is the King of Heaven, it follows that we are all brethren and belong to the Kingdom of Heaven at once, and here on earth. As John the Baptist said, “The Kingdom of Heaven is *at hand* ! ”

To put the thing in another way : all things which exist have some sort of life which, through disintegration, leads to new forms of life. Therefore, life is all one and, since all life is of God, there are no real boundaries between creature and Creator. We are all part of life which is of God, and, potentially, “joint-heirs with Christ ” to the Kingdom of God. If we choose to abide in Christ, we immediately enter into the Kingdom of Heaven at once and here on earth.

Whichever way we put it we are called upon to live as the children of one Father and the citizens of one Kingdom, and our worth will be estimated by the service we yield to our brethren, and the loyalty we yield to our King. But, if Fatherhood implies love and forgiveness, Kingship postulates the existence of laws and the consequences of infringing them. The test of service to our fellows and of loyalty to God, is our moral aim—if this aim be to co-operate with the Divine Will, our power to “remove mountains ” is simply commensurate with our faith.

What a child wants first of all is a practical and a working religion, not things that it must learn, but things that it should do. For instance, a good many people think that if a child says its prayers, attends church, and learns a number of facts from Holy Writ, it is on the high road to

salvation even if it should fail to practise that charity which Our Lord inculcated as the chiefest of virtues. We are apt to look on religion as an affair of the intellect rather than of the heart, rather of words than of deeds, and it is somewhat typical of Englishmen to regard religion as a thing of gloom and ceremonies rather than as a thing of comfort and good deeds. The result is that religion only too often produces either apathy or priggishness.

We must all be appalled at the present state of "civilisation"—by the predatory and tigerish nature of international politics, the selfishness and contempt of moral discipline among individuals, and the brutal materialism of journalism and commerce—and, though we find that the governing classes of Britain and America are generally actuated by Christian principles, it is surely a mistake to suppose that Christian principles can continue to live indefinitely if severed from the creed which produced and nourishes them. If then we admit that we do in fact live, and are governed by Christian standards, we must needs admit that the Christian creed must be an integral part of our system of education.

Many good Christians look askance at the teaching of science in schools because they are afraid that the study of science may shake a child's faith in its religion. In the first place, no elementary school has time to teach a child much more than a little Nature Study, which lends itself admirably to an exposition of God's wonderful work. Secondly, it is a mistake to suppose that science is any longer

necessarily antagonistic to religion, for science is now rather the friend than the foe of Christianity, since the professors of both are fellow seekers of Truth. Thirdly, the true Christian cannot possibly fear the truth—the more he is convinced of the truth of his religion, the more he will welcome the efforts of scientists to discover and establish the truth. Fourthly, we should remember that Christ's teaching — not man's interpretations thereof — has stood the test of nearly 2,000 years during which science has progressed by a process of continually recanting a certain amount of what it had accepted and proclaimed as truth.

The scientific truth of to-day is not infrequently the scientific fallacy of to-morrow. As Sir William Barrett said, "You must remember the history of science: hypnotism was called 'an odious fraud' 80 years ago, meteorites were derided as nonsensical a century ago, the phonograph was described as pure nonsense, the telephone as 'a Yankee story,' and X-rays as 'amusing, but no good to surgery'—*that* was the history of science." To which we may add Einstein's recent demolition of much that Newton had taught and scientists had proclaimed as the truth. As Mr. Wake Cook said on the same occasion, "All the fundamental ideas of science have changed and are changing." As Sir Richard Gregory has said, "There is, indeed, little general scientific knowledge among scientific men—they hold degrees in chemistry, physics, and biology, but know little of any other [science]."

If any scientist should venture to deride the

teaching of Christ, he may well be invited to pick the beam out of his own eye before he presumes to remove the mote from other people's eyes.

I would summarize by saying that, since "Sexual Ethics" are a matter of morality, the cure of sexual, of *all*, immorality must be moral—the assimilation of the highest code of morals, *commencing with children*. Since the highest code of morals is embodied in the Christian Religion, since the most advanced nations are those that profess the Christian Faith and, since the best governed states are those which are administered on Christian principles, Christianity must be an integral and fundamental part of our education.

The Christianity we teach our children must be such as is suited to their intelligence—it should be simple, sincere, practical and devoid of all dogma not fully authorised by the Gospels. But religion is not sufficient by itself to produce a *robust* spirituality—we must needs call in games to our assistance. And these games must be such as entail teamwork and a spice of danger, and *they must be played in the proper spirit*.

Finally, when we think with pride of our Empire, and of the blessings which our rule has brought to backward peoples—always in the spirit of "Lest we forget"—and when we pay homage in our hearts to the men, high and low, who have created our Empire, and the men who now maintain it, let us remember that they were and are what their mothers made them. *They learnt their greatness at their mothers' knees*. And of what sort those mothers were I would quote the late Mr. Page,

the American Ambassador in London during the War, who wrote in one of his letters, since published, about the British : “ It’s the *one* race in this world that’s got the guts. Hear this in confirmation : I suppose 1,000 English women have been to see me—as a last hope—to ask me to have enquiries made in Germany about their ‘ missing ’ sons or husbands, generally sons. They are of every class and rank and kind, from marchionesses to scrub-women. Every one tells her story with the same dignity of grief, the same marvellous self-restraint, the same courtesy and deference and sorrowful pride. Not one has whimpered—but one. And it turned out that she was a Belgian. It’s the breed : Spartan mothers were theatrical and pinch-beck compared to these women.” The future of mankind rests with the mothers of to-day and to-morrow.

## THE CARE OF ADOLESCENT BOYS.

BY THE REV. W. H. H. ELLIOTT, M.A.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF ADOLESCENCE.

BETWEEN the ages of 14 to 20, in the case of a boy, there takes place that wonderful change by which he passes from the state of a child to that of a man. The change is one which concerns his whole nature, his body, mind and soul. His body, besides outward changes, develops the power of reproduction—a power vital to his very being, the God-given means for the transmission of life and the continuance of the race. This sex development is present also in the mind. The boy's thoughts are different, his attitude towards his fellows changes, he begins to think for himself. The life of his soul is none the less influenced, and puberty reached, the adolescent begins to seek after God for himself rather than just to accept God as He is presented to him. He finds a new joy in worship, and enters more deeply into the meaning of our Lord's Sacramental Presence. He discovers Christ for himself. Or, on the contrary, no longer a child, he seeks maybe to satisfy the innate craving of his spiritual being (of which as such he is of course unconscious) by the employment of means of transient pleasure, which in the end invariably fail to satisfy that longing. He may give up going to church—regards

“ compulsory chapels ” as worse than a bore. He may be, for a time at least, the despair of his parish priest who numbers him amongst the “ lapsed ” ; and fails to recognise that in truth this is but a passing stage, a mark of that desire for self-determination which is one of the effects of the first development of sex consciousness upon the soul.

Adolescence is that period of life from fourteen to twenty which in a boy marks the growth of body, mind and soul, and extends for a period of six years or more, until he emerges from this most difficult transition stage an adult. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that any survey of this period must include all three parts of human nature. Too often people are inclined to think that physical change at the time of adolescence is all that need be taken into account, but the instincts of self-preservation and self-reproduction affect profoundly the mind and the soul as well as the body, and to ignore them in dealing with the adolescent boy is to court certain disaster.

This accounts for that extraordinary contradiction in his nature which some older folk—failing to understand (for how soon does the man forget that he was once a boy)—call obstinacy, and which causes them to dislike him ; and which even those who love him feel, at times, so trying. Adolescence is the age of contradiction. On the one hand the boy is very shy with people older than himself, and with little children ; on the other he is capable of boldness, while deeds of daring and true chivalry come as second nature. On the one hand adoles-

cence is the age of brute force, almost, at times, of cruelty to those weaker than himself, and to animals, yet he can show real tenderness, and those sterling qualities which make a gentle man. At one time he will entrust us with his full and free confidence, at another he is so secretive that it would seem as if nothing could draw from him the nature of his thoughts, nor cause him to divulge his difficulties. At one moment he is our despair from sheer bravado, and again he surprises us by showing his deep-seated humility, for which his bravado was but the outward camouflage, to protect his character, as it were, by the odd means of doing exactly the opposite from what he wanted or intended. All this contradiction which shows itself in countless ways, is but one of the marks of the desperate struggle of adolescence until the soul finds its emancipation in adult life. Throughout this whole period the struggle is maintained. Not that the boy is conscious of it, nor does he understand himself—he would indeed be a terrible creature, who thus could analyse himself and his actions—but that in the process of ordered development the transition stage is indeed a struggle. New forces, new powers are brought into play, and until each has found its level in an ordered proportion, our adolescent is passing through an ordeal fiercer than any he has experienced before, and without that stability of character which later in life enables him to face life's greater problems and difficulties.



## HOME INFLUENCES.

The first factor which helps to decide the issue of this struggle is the influence of the boy's home. It is true that a boy at a public school sees little of his parents for two-thirds of the year—and that for other reasons the working boy will probably spend considerably less of his daily life at home. The influence of home, however, still remains the most important factor in the guidance of the boy's life, though school or work may seem to overshadow it. If he has parents who realise their responsibility from the highest motives, and who will lead and not drive, he is indeed fortunate. Alas, how many parents are altogether careless of this responsibility! and how many adopt the line that the boy is old enough now to look after himself! So he is in one sense, but not in another. For that which counts above all is the steady influence of a really Christian home, in which parents and sons are real friends together, in which complete confidence between both exist, and in which there is that subtle atmosphere, that Spirit which is of God which tends all the time to raise the boy's ideals and to build up his character. This parental responsibility is in a measure shared by schoolmaster, scoutmaster, or club manager, and it is doubtless true that the influence of a first rate master is better than that of a second rate home: nevertheless, the home occupies a place which nothing, however good, can ever quite take, and parents must realise the enormous responsibility with which God has entrusted them, by

giving into their charge the moulding of lives made for Him.

This leads on to two further problems which profoundly affect the life and character of the adolescent, but which unquestionably ought to have been dealt with in the period of his life preceding puberty, and not during adolescence. The first is that he must be told, in the right way and by the right person, the facts of sex, and he must acquire a practical knowledge of himself. A false and cruel prudence has allowed boys to become adolescent without any right explanation of the new powers with which God is endowing them, and without any accurate knowledge of the differences of sex. Failure to receive this counsel has caused thousands of men mental anguish for years, and has even led to an abhorrence of those most wonderful means of creative power which, holy and God-given as they undoubtedly are, they share with God Himself, the Father of us all.

It was a vain hope that led the parents to believe that the boy was innocent. He was not. The knowledge which his parents refused to impart was supplied by others in the wrong way instead of the right. The child's curiosity demanded satisfaction, and he found it easily supplied in the playground, the street, through other boys, or through putrid literature and revolting pictures. In any normal boy the sexual passion is predominant at the period of adolescence, and unless he is told beforehand of the miracle of the transmission of life and the sanctity of the

means of transmission, he is forced to face the struggle of adolescence in all parts of his nature unarmed, an easy prey to the lurking temptation which exists on the part of himself and of others.

Ideally when relations of complete confidence exist between father and son, it is the father's duty, before the boy reaches 14 years of age, to tell him fully and frankly all the meaning of sex, its differences, its sanctity, and the fact that it is divine since our human nature is shared by our Lord Himself. If for any reason the father feels unable to do this, let him without fail commission his priest, the school-master, or one whom the boy trusts implicitly to undertake this sacred and solemn duty. The opportunity for this talk is better seized than planned beforehand. It is much more natural to choose an occasion when the subject comes up spontaneously. Then let the truth be told. It is as wicked and as cruel to say what is not strictly true as it is to say nothing. After all the boy has the right to know. Also let it be the whole truth. At this age a boy will know all sooner or later, and more than probably from undesirable sources in a wrong and garbled fashion. It must be the whole truth, though to say this may mean, probably will mean, on the part of the father an aching heart to tell. It is no light task, but it is one of the sacred responsibilities of parenthood. Then let the truth be told in all reverence. There is no shame in the God-given instincts of sex; they are only shameful when abused by man, and it is to save the boy from this that the truth must be told in reverence. It is characteristic of a boy that a

man can, as a rule, appeal successfully to his higher nature. Tell him then under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Author and Giver of Life, the mysteries and miracle of pro-creation, the means with which he is endowed to carry out in this way the Divine purpose of God. Inspire him jealously to guard these means, till in God's own time he can put them to their lawful, sacred, use. Put it to him on the highest grounds; he can rise to them now : if from cowardice or natural shrinking the telling is delayed, he may not then be able to rise to these sublime heights.

#### CONFIRMATION — CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

In the second place, the adolescent must be armed for his struggle with the means which God supplies; for the physical and the spiritual can no more be separated in this than in any other part of life. Indeed, the very word struggle implies armour, and it were folly as well as cruelty to send a soldier to fight in battle without the best of armour. The greatest means of strength which God supplies is the Sacrament of His Most Holy Body and Blood, that He dwelling in us and we in Him, we may have power and strength to have the victory and to triumph against the devil, the world and the flesh. Yet such is the tyranny of our English custom, that we delay to give this heavenly armour, as a rule, until the boy is in the very throes of that terrible struggle with himself. As a rule, he is confirmed at a time when, with so much mental and physical disturbance going on,

he can least appreciate spiritual matters. His body is changing, he knows not what to make of it: his mind is confused, he is half afraid of himself: he knows not what to think. New feelings and experiences, fraught with danger which he scarcely understands are his; and custom has laid down that this is the time—from 14-16—when he should come to receive the strengthening power of the Holy Ghost and the privilege of his communions. What wonder that so often it is purely formal. The boy's whole being is pre-occupied. He cannot at such a moment understand or assimilate so priceless a gift. It comes at too late a time. The boy must be sent to the battle not only forewarned, but forearmed. On all grounds, physical, mental, psychological, we must break down our prejudices and let the child be confirmed before the age of puberty. Let him have the strength at hand to fight, when adolescence faces him. Let him have grown accustomed to his Communions before his struggle with himself starts, so that he may then know that he does not fight alone. Do not deny him the right, which is his, to have that inward strength as well as that outward knowledge which can keep him pure, and enable him to formulate of his own, something of the character of Christ.

With all this change going on in all parts of his being, no wonder that the beginning of adolescence is a difficult time for the boy himself, and for those who have to deal with him. In the case of the public school boy, this time coincides roughly with the time of his leaving his private school where

at the moment he was one of the eldest among juniors; and of his entering a public school where he finds himself a junior among seniors. He enters a new life of somewhat greater freedom, and altogether different surroundings. Less shielded, here begins the test of that home influence upon which such stress has already been laid; and further, the test of that religious training which should enable him to face successfully the entirely new set of difficulties and temptations which suddenly are his. With the working boy, this period of change is even more definitely pronounced. He leaves school and goes out into the world to start to earn his living: and whether he be fortunate enough to have opportunity to learn a skilled trade, or whether circumstances or lack of ability force him on to the market of unskilled labour, he is suddenly thrust into the world of work to face the same difficulties and temptations as his more fortunate brother, but without that guidance of housemasters which may be so invaluable, and that school tradition which has raised the Public Schools of England to be the envy of all the civilized world. The working boy at once takes a different status in the home life, for he is now partly a breadwinner, and has rights of his own: and his new found liberty is his greatest danger as well as his best opportunity. The great difficulty which faces those who have to deal with the adolescent at this stage is the bridging of the gap between these two periods. The public school boy has to conform to the rules of his school: but the working boy often takes advantage of his new

born freedom, to cast aside those influences which helped him as a child. He leaves Sunday School. Of necessity he can no longer be a choir boy. Whereas before he was amenable and tractable, and always was to be found at Church on Sunday, now he too often drops this as well, so that hundreds of parish priests are faced with the problem of how to keep their boys who once were such models of attendance, and now seem to have lost all faith and all interest in religion. The boy may join a club, and the influence of a good club, and better still of a good club manager, cannot be denied, but, as a rule, definite spiritual interest is lacking, and it is questionable from a priest's point of view, if such numbers of hours ought to be given by a priest to club work as is now often the case. The problem can only be solved by appealing to the consciousness of freedom and responsibility which are now the boy's. In the first place, he should already have been confirmed and should have acquired the habit of regular Communion. If this has been taught and accepted, the first great bridge across the gap will have been built. The boy then must be given church work which appeals to his sense of responsibility, and the appeal if put in the right way rarely fails. This is true of the large city or town parish, and equally true of the small country village of agricultural labourers. If the boy has the chance he will respond: but too often, he never knows of the chance, and drifts aimlessly. The highest service which the boy can be given is to serve at the Altar. If he has been taught to

find in Our Lord Jesus Christ, his Hero, he will easily be taught as a server to follow Him whose life principle was 'I am among you as He that serveth.' He so readily assimilates the great realities of Love in service, Reverence, and Holy Fear, that be the ritual ever so simple, the work so close to our Lord, gives the lad that spirit which will save him and keep him true throughout these difficult years; besides adding a dignity to the Worship of the Altar, and being of real help to his fellow servers and to those whose work lies in some other direction. Appeal to him on the lowest grounds—first that he is needed—that our Lord wants his help—that this is one of his greatest privileges. Sooner or later then, he will offer his services from the highest grounds of love. Besides his Communion and his work as a server, Catechism in Church is a most valuable bridge. From the boy's point of view, he will come readily when he finds that instead of being a child in Sunday School, he is one amongst older adolescents. It appeals to his instinct at this age to be 'doing things together': while it offers a welcome outlet for work and responsibility to be appointed to the office of a 'Leader' of Catechism. From the priest's point of view, he is able to continue his instruction of the lad on lines very different from the Junior Sunday School. He can go much more fully into the meaning of Church doctrine and teaching; and the system appeals to all parts of the boy's nature. Memory, in question and answer; intellect, in the taking of notes and the writing of analyses; and



heart, in the appeal of the homily which out of the instruction sums up the practical spiritual lesson. Lest it should be said that this system cannot be applied everywhere, but only under particular conditions, it may be seen to be working as far the most effective means of teaching adolescents what they should know, believe, and do in places as widely different as a large London parish with several hundred members, and a small country village of a handful of people with only twenty members. The religious instinct, and the sex instinct, are by far the greatest emotions which affect a boy at this time of his life : and if the gap is to be bridged between childhood and adolescence, both must be provided for ; the one regulated in self mastery by the other, through such means as have been indicated, making use of the boy's willingness to undertake work and responsibility in the service of Him Who is Perfect Man as well as Perfect God, and Who as Man underwent the like difficulties of adolescence, yet without sin.

The boy is not, of course, fully conscious of these masterful influences : he is no more always talking about sex than he is about God. Indeed, except to his most intimate friends of the same age he is unlikely to talk much at all of what he feels most deeply ; but though he does not realise it, these are the influences which at this time of life affect him more strongly than any others. So it is that these forces account for the particular characteristics of the adolescent boy.

## HERO WORSHIP.

The first of these forces is Hero Worship, an expression in some measure of what he himself would really like to be. It may be the captain of his School Eleven or Fifteen who is his hero. It may be some Naval or Military leader who fires his imagination, so that he thinks no other man in the world can be like him. It may be his housemaster or his scoutmaster—a great explorer, traveller or hunter. Whoever it may be, the normal adolescent will have his hero, who is to him the personification of all that a man should be; and who fills his mind to such a degree that through him, he forms his imagination of the Divine for the time being. Through him he learns, if he may, those lessons of devotion to duty, sacrifice and service which in this formative period exercise so profound an influence upon character, give the boy an ideal and help him to try to live up to it. Yet, if at the age of 16, his hero is all that is perfect, the time is bound to come when the idol must fall from its high pedestal, and the boy will find that great as his hero is he fails him at some point. What an opportunity then is offered to every worker amongst boys to make use of this invariable trait of hero worship, and to lead him on to the Hero who never fails. To show him those very qualities which in his heart of hearts he most admires, in the Person of our Lord: and more than this to demonstrate the motive of these qualities. To show him that what impels sacrifice and service and devotion to a cause, is *love*, which

found its highest expression in the Incarnation and upon the Cross. This is just what the boy really is wanting to know, though he could not tell you so. Not yet spoilt by the world and the competition for life and living, he naturally seeks to give rather than to receive. The very innate generosity of a boy's nature leads him to wish to do this, if he can only be shown how: while the power of love and the compelling attraction of the Cross give him that motive, which his reason demands. For the adolescent, beginning to think for himself, wants to know *why*, as well as *how*.

#### THE HERD INSTINCT.

If Hero Worship is characteristic of his religious nature, what has been called the Herd Instinct is indicative of those developing physical powers which are changing the lad from child to adult. This herd instinct may be seen in a number of ways. The adolescent will not do things singly and alone; he needs the support of a crowd or, at anyrate, of others. Watch the streets in South London on a Saturday night, we shall see group after group of boys of this age moving together, singing, jostling, and doing together what no one of them would do singly; giving vent to their high spirits in a manner not always pleasing to their elders. In a crowd together they will flock to see their favourite football team play. This very herd instinct is the cause of those gangs of so-called hooligans, who make war on each other, and sometimes on

those who do not appreciate their rough horse play. Though some are out for deliberate harm and ill doing, the majority are little more than a nuisance, giving vent to their new found liberty in a self expression which seeks to demand their rights in a world which hitherto has denied them much of freedom. The same instinct may be seen in a different way in almost any country church. The lads of the village will not come singly to church. They will not be conspicuous: but they will come together in a crowd. They will not sit separately anywhere, but altogether at the back in the last pew if possible.

The herd instinct is natural and normal for any adolescent, and since this is so, it must be brought into use in dealing with the growing lad, with the consciousness that it is the boy's nature which demands it. It is important to recognise this herd instinct which must be guided and led in the right direction, so that it may play its decisive part in the formation of the growing character. It must be used for spiritual ends, and the church must provide the means, or rather she herself must become the satisfaction of this natural craving. After all, it is, in embryo, the very same as in the larger world of adult life, when people realise the truth of the common bond which unites all Christians in one fellowship. We are members one of another. We do believe in the Communion of Saints, the Fatherhood of God, and the consequent brotherhood of man. The adolescent is just discovering this truth, which finds its expression in this 'herd instinct.' It is a natural evolution.

At first the child himself is the unit : then comes the home, followed by the school.

The next stage in this individual development is the somewhat enlarged circle which includes his fellows of a like age : till this in turn gives place to the larger outlook still, when he recognises himself as one of a society, a nation, a world, the Church. The Church must then provide for and make use of this instinct in process of development. Here Church clubs and societies play their part. Whether it be the Guild of the Servants of the Sanctuary, the Church Lads' Brigade, Scouts, the evening club, some outlet must be provided for the expression of this corporate desire to move together, which, if wisely guided, will turn this natural desire to the highest ends.

#### THE INSTINCT OF SERVICE.

The third great characteristic of the adolescent is the need for an outlet of energy—the practical instinct ; that is, that he must needs be up and doing something. His whole being is restless, he wants an outlet for his pent up energy. He may not say much, but the appeal for service, to do something rarely fails to find a ready response. Again, this natural instinct must be used, directed and trained, so that the lad may form in himself the habit of working for others ; and may learn the lesson that the highest happiness is the outcome of unselfishness, and not the satisfaction of his own desires. In other words, he is ready to

learn the lesson of self-control for the sake of others, a control which will enter into every part of his life, if only he be shown the way. Is not this once more the opportunity of the Church to provide the outlet for service: to point again to The Hero who came 'not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life': and to show how the highest service and the noblest work can only be achieved by self-sacrifice and self-control, by putting God first, one's fellows next, and self last. The adolescent's character is in the formative stage. True as it is, that the early and half forgotten impressions of almost babyhood have a tremendous, though unconscious, influence at this time; it is none the less true that the lad is beginning to realise himself, and his own individual personality. He sees what he is, what he may be, what he ought to be. His will is beginning to direct his actions for himself, instead of being submitted always to the will of his seniors. His natural characteristics must be brought to bear upon the training of his will; he is beginning to realise the power of his own will, and the responsibility of choice. He must be taught the tremendous importance of victory over his own will, and he must be inspired with the will to win that victory. He can understand much more of what that means than his elders generally realise. He can now rise to the heights; and learn, and love to learn, because he likes something difficult to do that :

Our wills are ours, we know not how  
Our wills are ours, to make them Thine.

## THE DANGERS OF IGNORANCE.

It is this victory over the will, the mastery over himself, which is the boy's greatest struggle during the period of adolescence. While it is true that throughout life the will must always be conformed to the will of God through union and communion with Him, the fight in earnest ought to start with adolescence; and the longer it is delayed the harder does it become. The boy's will then, strengthened and guided by the means of grace and the Holy Spirit, must be brought to bear upon his besetting temptations. By far the strongest of these is to abuse, by himself or with others, those divinely given powers of reproduction of which he has just become conscious, and which are altering his whole nature. Too much stress cannot be laid upon the fact that he should already have been forewarned and forearmed. A false prudery has made us shrink from telling a boy about himself, so that he is plunged into the fight with himself ignorant to a large extent of the truth. While this very silence on the part of those who could and should have told him, has led to his thinking that there was something shameful about that which is most holy and sacred. Something disgraceful about that which he should have learnt was divine. With no knowledge, or very inadequate knowledge, he is thrown into the vortex of life with men older than himself: he experiences new sensations which are too often interpreted to him with a coarse joke or laugh by those most unfitted to tell him about himself. He

is swept off his feet by the tide of passion, and in thousands of cases, before he knows or realises what is happening, he is led into that first act of self-abuse with himself, with some older boy, or even man, which, at least, soils the purity of his heart and mind, and which for years, or perhaps a lifetime, may cause him so hard a fight with his own nature that he almost or quite despairs of ever conquering himself. A lad may be told that he will endanger his health unless he gives way to these natural desires. That this is not true any man in his heart of hearts knows only too well: but such is the extent of this temptation that priests and doctors (who often are the only people to know because of the seal of secrecy in their calling) do not hesitate to say that as high a percentage as 75 per cent. of men to-day either have suffered or are suffering from the evil of self-abuse, due originally to the first act as a boy. Can any tragedy be more pathetic? That such a sin should hang like a great weight for years upon boy and man, humanly speaking because he was not told and warned by those to whom God entrusted the up-bringing of a life for which they, with Him, were responsible; and because he was not given nor shown the means which God supplies to enable him to fight successfully against 'the flesh'; nor taught that God's Holy Spirit was given him in order that he might find strength in time of need to make him holy. This false prudery must be broken down, indeed, it is being broken down: and if the lines indicated are followed, the grace of God is sufficient to keep a boy



pure in the midst of the greatest temptation. A boy's nature will always be what it is, and at this period the sex instinct being so compelling, the temptation to self-abuse is bound to come to nearly every normal boy of ordinary passions; but it can be guarded against, and can be fought successfully. Let there be no shadow of doubt about this. The question, however, arises; how can boys be helped to conquer themselves when they have already given way to this temptation? For this is what most workers amongst boys must face. There must first be a definite act of will on the part of the boy. He cannot do anything for himself unless he genuinely has the will to overcome his evil habit. To help the boy who has not the will to conquer himself, nothing can be done except prayer on his behalf that he may be led to wish to be absolutely pure. The boy who has the will, however, will find that it is possible to conquer, though probably after many a struggle in which he shares to the full the cry of human weakness uttered by St. Paul: 'The good that I would, I do not; and the evil that I would not, that I do.' With the will to victory a lad must consult someone whom he can trust implicitly, and who has had experience in dealing with such cases; and who, while understanding the power of the temptation, can at the same time be both sympathetic and firm. He can be helped by love, never by fear; by the truth, never by what is untrue, for it is the truth which makes us free. Yet, astounding as it is, there are many people who try in all earnestness to help him both by fear and by what is un-

true. It is not true that one who practises self-abuse will become insane or blind, nor will he become impotent or otherwise unfit for marriage or parenthood. Neither is it true that an outraged God regards this vice as an unpardonable desecration of the Temple of the Holy Ghost which must involve the wrongdoer in permanent punishment.

Such a mixture of fear and untruth usually has the opposite effect from that which is intended. The victim falls into despair, and is less than ever able to struggle against his temptation. Certainly the insane are usually masturbators, but self-abuse is not the cause of the nervous unsoundness, it is one of its effects.

It is true that habitual self-abuse produces stupidity. The undue loss of the testicular secretion interferes with nutrition and with the healthy development of every part of the organism. It is prejudicial to character and to health, and children who are self-abusers are nearly always below the normal standard of intelligence, industry, courage, frankness, and good temper.

What is true of the results of self-abuse is—First, that the longer that it is continued, the more hold does it take and the harder it is to conquer, so that every victory over the temptation is one step nearer self-emancipation. Secondly, that if persisted in for years, it has an effect upon the nervous system and character. Thirdly, that the effect normally is moral rather than physical. There is always present the consciousness of doing what is wrong, the knowledge of secret sin. This weighs upon the mind and produces a self-distrust and a despondency

which makes harder the effort to resist the next temptation. In its moral effect, it is the same as any other grave or mortal sin, and it is this moral effect which plays upon the mind. It is an outrage upon nature because it is unnatural, and offends deeply that other instinct which holds sway in the boy's being besides the sex instinct, viz.: the religious instinct, the divine within the human nature. So it is that the right lines upon which to help a boy who has fallen a victim to this temptation are to be found along the lines of appeal to his religious instinct. Generally, he must be shown that he shares this creative power, which is his snare, with God Himself. His ideals must be lifted to the All-Pure, the All-Holy. He must be inspired to conquer himself by being shown the God-given means of grace for this very purpose. He must be assured that it is possible to conquer, as the lives of some of the greatest saints as well as hundreds of others prove, and he must learn self-mastery in all things. At a later stage of adolescence the boy may be helped by the thought of the purity of his sisters, or even more the purity of the girl whom, one day, he may marry; and by the fact that as he would wish her to come to him pure and unspotted from the world, so he in return must come to her, if not alas pure from himself, at any rate having conquered impurity with himself. The right of an equal standard of morality for both sexes must be insisted upon, in spite of the fact that the moral standard of the day in civilized countries is such that the mother who would feel the deepest sense of shame if her daughter "went wrong,"

has too often no such feeling with regard to her son.

Particularly, the youthful offender must be led to pray for strength to conquer himself. As a rule, long prayers about himself tend to make a lad too introspective, and lead him to think of those things which by their very nature he should not think about much. Rather the short daily prayer for help to be faithful, true and pure is what should be recommended ; while he must be taught the use of ejaculatory prayer at the moment of temptation. Just when the stress comes he should say, “ O God, keep me pure ; ” or, “ O my God, give me strength to resist temptation,” or some such short prayer. Some may find it helpful to sign themselves at such a time with the sign of the Cross to remind them that they are dedicated to Christ—pledged to be His faithful soldiers, and that they must not betray their trust, nor desert their Hero ; while most instructed boys will find it a help to have in their rooms a crucifix to remind them when temptation is present of Him “ whose they are,” from Whom they may get strength for the battle. They can realise what the sins of the flesh involve as they see the figure of the Crucified Christ ; or a picture of Sir Galahad in his armour spending the night in vigil, watch and prayer to meet the onslaught of the enemy.

If prayer be the first step in the struggle, there is no hesitation in saying that next any boy really in earnest must make up his mind to make his confession to some priest whom he can trust. If ever any one had an unquiet conscience, it surely

must be he who has the weight and burden of secret sin upon his mind, and moreover sin which he knows, because he has probably tried, that he cannot conquer in his own strength. In England there is on the part of many, and very largely amongst public school-masters, men and boys, a prejudice against confession, which is hard to understand. This prejudice must be broken down if this particular sin is to be overcome. Without it, the boy is afraid to speak to anyone who can really help him; he flounders around in his shame and fear, getting deeper and deeper into the mire, while here at hand are the very means appointed by Our Lord, and enjoined by the authority of the whole Church, for bringing absolution to the stricken soul, and for giving just that direction and guidance under the seal of confession which the boy above all else needs. How can he know how to set about conquering himself when he is afraid to ask anyone's advice; how can he be helped unless someone knows his difficulties and can put him on the right road to recovery. It is said by those whose prejudice is such that they have never made their confession themselves and who do not know, that to make his confession will weaken his will; that it will tend to make him rely on another instead of upon God and himself; or even that he will make no effort to conquer himself because he may always receive the benefit of absolution, so that confession defeats its own end. This is never said by those who alone have the right to speak of the effect of confession because they use this means of grace: and it is the experience of thousands that

the day of their first confession was the turning point in their lives which changed their hopeless outlook to one of sure and certain hope and final victory. Confession is not a magic by means of which a boy can become pure in a day, but it is the greatest help, as, indeed, it must be, since it is a divinely appointed means of grace. It is proof that the boy is in earnest, that he has the will to victory, even if he has not yet won victory over his lower nature. It bespeaks a genuine humility, for nothing can be more humbling than to make one's confession to God before a priest: and since the roots of impurity lie in pride, humility is the natural corrective. Further, since in the Church of England confession before a priest is voluntary, there is very little risk of formality; or of that spirit, if it exists, which takes up the line that sin does not matter because it can be forgiven. If such were the case with a penitent, repentance would not be real, and absolution would be refused. A wise director will be firm as well as filled with the Divine Love of the Saviour: he will be judge, but father also.

If a worker among boys has the confidence of a boy to such an extent that he tells him of his difficulty with regard to himself, it is his duty to advise him to go to some experienced and wise priest and make his confession; and though it may mean for the boy that he must use the whole strength of his being and determination to take the step, he will never regret it. Besides Prayer and Confession he should be advised also as to the right lines to take with regard to his body and his

dealings and intercourse with others. The right kind of work and exercise will tend to occupy his mind in the right way to the exclusion of wrong and impure thoughts which so readily pave the way to impure actions. An adolescent should have a proper amount of fresh air and good exercise in the form of swimming, cricket, football, etc.; but not to over excess as the temptation becomes stronger with over fatigue of body. He should not shirk a cold bath when this is possible, nor those harder things, the taking of the hard knocks which come in so many forms as part of the discipline of life. For self-control must be won partly through self-discipline. His mind must be employed in a healthy way—with the right kind of books for reading, rather than the suggestive novelette—with the right kind of friends who will tend to uplift his thoughts and elevate rather than lower them. It may be extraordinarily hard for a young man to give up friends, or people or places which are the cause to him of temptation; but he must do so, and must be helped to do so. The whole of him, his body, mind and spirit must be influenced and trained and guided; and he must be led to offer himself wholly in self-dedication to God. Too often failure has followed or victory has been lost, because only part was so dedicated. He made reservations. It was all but just this one thing. This failure must be treated directly by means of confession, and indirectly by such means as have been mentioned, so that giving himself to God and becoming more and more unselfish he may think of others rather than of

himself, and find an outlet for the restlessness of his nature in work and service, in games and exercise, till he is granted later on the fulness of this self-expression in the most sacred tie of Holy Matrimony with her who has unconsciously taught him that the only true love, the only love worthy of the name is that which involves the elimination of self and selfish desires, and in its place enthrones service and sacrifice; God first, others next, and self last.

#### BAD TEMPER AND BAD LANGUAGE.

Another form of lack of self-control which comes as temptation to the adolescent is anger and the loss of temper. Far less serious because so much easier to overcome. A boy must not be judged too hardly for these exhibitions of temper: they are really the consequence of one of the physical changes of his life, and he soon finds out that on the lowest grounds it does not pay, and on the highest that it is so unlike his Hero. There can scarcely be a better corrective than to encourage boxing for those who have to learn self-control of temper — for punishment is swift, sure, effective, and so eminently just, that it appeals to his sense of honour. A famous boxer, not renowned for his church-going, yet claimed that the Christian virtues could scarcely be better taught in a practical way than in the gymnasium by boxing. There is a great deal in this. Temptation of the tongue, to use bad language and to swear, is again common to most adolescents: and



once more, he must not be too hardly judged. He really means nothing by it, except that he considers it manly because so many men swear, and he finds it a relief to his feelings. When he discovers that "it is not done," that "it is not good form," he soon drops what is more a meaningless habit than a sin. It is remarkable that most boys swear amongst themselves, but show such natural control in their choice of words that they rarely swear at home, in their boys' club, or before women and girls. In the correction of these and other temptations of boyhood to lie, to steal, and so on, it is most important to remember that fear can never cure, but that unfailing love and patience will succeed. To take the extreme case where the boy has fallen foul of the Law, the State recognises this, for it no longer sends him to an ordinary prison in a negative way 'to do time' for his offence: it realises that what is required is positive, patient training, and teaching; so that instead of sending him for a short term of imprisonment, he is sentenced to a long term at a Borstal Institution where he may have opportunity to learn, what probably, through no fault of his own, he failed to learn before, and may be discharged a useful instead of a useless citizen, able to take his place in the industrial world of production with some chance of success.

At a later stage the temptations of the adolescent develop as he develops himself. During the earlier years it is no temptation to him to drink to excess, indeed, he does not like the taste of alcoholic liquors; but as he grows older this must

be added to his besetting temptations. Again, this is a question of self-control, and he must be taught that control of the appetite is a finer thing than total abstinence; and also warned that loss of self-control through drink is one of the commonest causes which lead on to more vicious sin. Gambling comes also into the list, for whatever opinion may be held in theory as to the right and wrong of gambling, it is certainly true that the adolescent cannot afford to risk his money in this way. It tends to take from him the will to do work of which he can be proud, and to substitute the spirit of getting something for nothing; while there is no question that it tends to excite those lower passions within him which again may lead him, almost before he is aware, into much more serious sin.

If his temptations are many, and those to which through inexperience he falls an easy prey, it is unquestionably true that his attractions and his good qualities are many also. He can show a very real affection, an affection without being affected, to those who have to deal with him. He responds very readily to the good which is put before him. He will rise to the occasion, if he be trusted and given the opportunity. His loyalty is beyond question, a loyalty to his friends no less than to his elders. He has an astute discernment between what rings true and what rings false, which leads him really to despise what is unworthy and to admire the good, noble, and true. He has a well developed sense of justice and fairness, which makes him accept a just punishment

without a murmur, but which, kindles a fierce, though probably suppressed, resentment if unjust. He has the deep-seated, though unacknowledged wish, really to be what God meant him to become. With all his failures his heart at bottom is right and true. His story may be one of constant failures, but he rises from his failures undaunted, with experience to persevere. If he is easily down, he the more readily gets up again. And if his struggle with himself be severe, even though it may mean going through the very fire, he does, as a rule, recover from his falls. The fire purges, cleanses. He does triumph over himself, and having won the victory of adolescence sets out on the next struggle, the fight of manhood — this time, however, not inexperienced in the art of spiritual warfare, but with the experience of past failures and with the assurance begotten of past victories. Adolescence is a thrilling time for this very reason. It is the first great adventure into the unknown world of realities. It breathes the fresh strong spirit of youth and optimism, untarnished by the more sordid facts of adult life. It is alive and bespeaks life—the first setting out on that path which will mean so many ups and downs, so much to conquer, so much to endure, which is so full of hope, so rich in promise, till it finds its fulfilment in that life which knows no end, for it is eternal.

These then are among the chief of the temptations, the good points, and the ordinary characteristics of the normal adolescent boy. In conclusion, a word is offered to those whose

responsibility and very great privilege it is to deal with him, whether they be parent, schoolmaster, club-worker, scoutmaster or parish priest. It is true that the influence of the early years of a boy's life cannot be overestimated, but it is none the less true that the influence of a man who is his real friend during the years of adolescence is tremendous also. In the formation of his own character the boy will have much to unlearn, correct, and adjust, besides much also to learn. He is feeling his feet at the beginning of a journey through a strange country. Here it is that he needs the gentle guidance of one who, though more experienced, has not forgotten that he himself was once a boy; and the help and direction of one whom the boy feels he understands and who understands him, in other words, a friend in the highest sense of the word. The boy himself is delightfully self-confident and assured, and would stoutly deny, if asked, that he needed guidance except in special cases: but this is where the skill of the 'friend' is shown in guiding unobtrusively, asserting the power of his own character in a way, not so as to impress the stamp of himself upon the boy, but to enable the boy to develop his own character himself, on right lines. The one is really a confession of failure on the part of the worker amongst boys, the other demonstrates his success: and both can be seen without travelling very far. Nothing must be done that prevents the boy from developing his own individuality, and especial care must be taken about this, difficult as it may be for the man with a strong personality.

It goes without saying that if a man is to teach a boy the value of prayer and the means of grace, he must himself be one who teaches as much or more by example, as by talking. No one is more shrewd than a boy, and he can tell instinctively if a man is genuine, and whether he really believes and practises what he preaches. A boy has no use for insincerity.

The teacher must have a natural enthusiasm for his task. No cause was ever won by the faint hearted, and no boy will ever be won except he unconsciously feels that he is wanted. He will then respond readily and inspire the worker with something of that keenness of his own which is characteristic of his youthful optimism. Nor does the question of age count for very much. It is quite likely that the younger man may more often appeal to boys than the older, but this is by no means a *sine qua non*. Not a few of the most successful workers among boys have kept young, when by score of years they should be accounted old. He must have infinite patience, and be prepared to take any amount of pains. So often the boy is trying : so often annoying : so often he will do the very thing that it is hoped he will not do. All this requires that tact and real patience and consideration which makes a gentle man. And with this necessarily goes real control of self and temper. However much it may be unsought, the boy does look to those who deal with him for his ideal. He will see and judge of adult and of Christian life by what he sees and knows of it in those with whom he is brought in contact. Above

all there must be real love, given and reciprocated. Whereas this is the strongest force of all which can be brought to bear on the forming character, and is quite essential since God Himself is Love, it is also the greatest danger, for human love necessarily partakes of the weakness of human nature, and so cannot be perfect yet. The greatest care then must be taken that this love emanates from the highest motive, else it may lead to danger on both sides. It may spoil the man, it may make a prig of the boy. The right kind of love in no manner resembles at all sentimental mawkishness nor a weak effeminacy: indeed, the healthy boy would have none of this travesty of love: but it will be seen and felt because of its expression: an expression which willingly offers service and is glad to make sacrifice. That is what counts more than all else. And when the boy sees in him to whom he looks up these very characteristics which it is hoped will be his own, he will learn the joy of giving instead of getting, and will have mastered the greatest lesson of all before starting out on adult life.

The responsibilities no less than the influence, of those who deal with the adolescent boy are enormous: But it is a task full of joy, and hope and happiness, which is more than amply repaid by the boys themselves. Many a man feeling that he ought to do something for his less fortunate brothers, has taken up club or scout work in the spirit that he had come to give them something of the chances and advantages which he himself has had: and many a man has found that coming to

give he has received for himself far more than ever he gave. Indeed, in this way by mutual service each to the other both have given, both have learnt : so that each side, the one consciously, the other unconsciously, has proved that, indeed, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

"Adolescence," Stephen Paget, F.R.C.S. ; "The Manners of the Kingdom," Father Turner, S.S.J.E. ; "The Forge and the Anvil," Canon E. Lyttelton.

# THE PROBLEM OF THE ADOLESCENT GIRL.

BY MISS HELENA POWELL.

It will be perhaps not altogether unprofitable to disclaim from the outset any implication in the term "problem" in regard to the adolescent stage of development, which would justify the not uncommon assumption that it is a perplexing, baffling, even distressing thing.

Adolescence, like other stages of development, is in itself quite natural and healthy. There is no need to look for trouble and to rush to the psychoanalyst to discover a "hidden complex" whenever a growing girl shows signs of temper or self-will. It is possible to make the mistake of putting down to "pure cussedness" some weakness which is a symptom of physical or mental disease, but, in the long run, the danger on this side is much less than that of the tendency to attribute every lapse of self-control to some occult source.

But, when this is said, adolescence has its own dangers and difficulties. Life, by its very nature, involves difficulties; and in adolescence the child is invaded by a rush of new life, coming upon her like a flood, and it is small wonder if now and again she is swept off her feet by it. Powers—physical, mental, spiritual—hitherto dormant in her, are



roused into activity, taking her by surprise; no wonder if she is at first bewildered, and loses her balance.

With some girls the adjustment to the new conditions of physical and mental life takes place very simply and gradually. They are not acutely conscious of any great change, still less of catastrophe; they take life as it comes, being constituted, as the current phrase runs, rather as extroverts than introverts; more interested in outward events and objects than in analysing the effect of these upon their consciousness.

But there are many girls whose mental and spiritual condition reflects the physical; and just as the quickly growing body is at some stages, in some individuals, lanky and disproportioned; clumsy, because its owner has not yet learnt to measure the length of her limb or the weight of her hand, and has not achieved a perfect control over her own movements, so do her affections and impulses suffer from a like want of proportion and adjustment: she is swayed from time to time by gusts of extravagant emotion: her likes and dislikes are violent and unreasonable: wild animal spirits alternate with moods of depression or sullen discontent. For some days she will live in a state of elation, figuring herself as destined to play the part of a second Joan of Arc, or, at least, a Florence Nightingale, forgetful of the ordinary daily duties and the claims of others, till perhaps brought suddenly to earth by the unpleasant consequences of such neglect, she is plunged into depths of self-depreciation, or of des-

pair at the want of comprehension shown by a prosaic and unsympathetic world. Grievances, real or imaginary, are seized upon by an irritable self-consciousness, and nursed till they fill all the mental horizon, and the result is a mood of *accidie* when life seems "tedious as a twice told tale." The girl in this condition is only dimly aware of the unreality of her pose—where it is a pose—a love of melancholy as making her more interesting, certainly to herself and, as she fondly thinks, to others also; and she will "be sad even for wantonness."

Or it may be, and often is, that the unhappiness is real, arising from fears that beset the mind which is as yet unacquainted with itself. It not seldom happens that some "growing pain," in itself quite without significance, is interpreted by the girl as a symptom of some fell disease which she believes to be sapping her life; and yet she is too shy to ask advice of those who could reassure her. Or the trouble may occur in the spiritual sphere. Not seldom the form taken by her mental disturbance is that of a morbid conscientiousness which magnifies every slight offence into a grievous sin. The dread of having committed "the unforgivable sin" haunts many a sensitive adolescent conscience, causing unspeakable misery, so unnecessary, but yet so real at the time. Girls at this stage have often a strongly developed, and highly emotional religious consciousness — producing, as in Maggie Tulliver, ecstasies of joy, delight in self-sacrifice, and storms of contrition and despair. For it is characteristic of the unbalanced condition which is incidental to the

period of rapid growth, that the girl overrates her own strength, and is less advanced in the moral than in the religious consciousness, and often from heights of idealism she comes to ground with disastrous consequences in actual performance; as when a girl, strongly convinced of the duty of fasting and almsgiving through Lent, bestowed daily upon a crossing sweeper the shilling that her mother had given her to pay for her school dinner, quite oblivious of the fact that she was misappropriating funds entrusted to her. While the dishonesty of that action never dawned upon her, she was from time to time overcome by remorse at her failure in self-discipline when, pressed by hunger, she gave way to procuring some lunch on credit of the next day's shilling.

Other lesser terrors, of physical fear, shyness, dread of ridicule, and self-consciousness in other painful forms, haunt the adolescent age, and often make a girl's life very far removed from that of careless happiness which is supposed to be characteristic of youth, and the result may easily be a permanent distortion of character, or the formation of a fixed idea which will adversely affect the outlook and life of the grown woman.

Paradoxical as it may seem, a condition of morbid self-distrust is often accompanied by a greatly exaggerated sense of self-importance and uniqueness of personality, and a very general result is a great desire to be independent and to stand alone. This holds a girl back from seeking the help of those who might give her the guidance and balance which she so sorely needs. A spirit of

rebellion against all authority, whether of God or man, is very often characteristic of this stage of adolescence. A girl is resentful of interference or control from her mother or other rightful authorities; inclined to be scornful of the "Victorian" attitude of those who seek to restrain her; proud of defying the laws of health, feeling that to refuse to change her stockings when her feet are wet is a proof of originality and independence which marks her as a superior being. It may well be, too, that she will delight in giving utterance to "unorthodox" sentiments, and proclaim that she has "come to the end of" the religious teaching of her early days, and has "no use for" it. Or perhaps she will take up a position of resentment against life and its difficulties. "I can't thank God for my creation; I didn't ask Him to make me," is the petulant outcry of many a cynic in her teens, convinced that the remark is entirely original, and that life is a burden from which she would only too gladly be freed.

This, as well as the opposite mood of extreme religious sensitiveness, shows the adolescent girl as crude, self-centred, unbalanced. In much that she says or does she is only "playing to the gallery" of her very unsettled self, and secretly is half ashamed and afraid of the part she is playing, not quite sure whether it is a part or whether she really means it.

But, after all, there is nothing that need surprise us in this condition of unstable equilibrium. Life is coming upon the child too quickly and too vehemently for her to be able to deal with it; she

is overwhelmed and disconcerted, like one who suddenly becomes possessed of riches.

“All prudent counsel as to what befits  
The golden mean, is lost on such a one,  
The man's fantastic will is the man's law.”

Some struggle successfully through this time of storm and stress by themselves without direct aid from any fellow creature, and perhaps they are the stronger in the end. But some go under, or are, at least, rendered permanently weaker in character, less joyous and trustful than they would have been if they had been helped through this difficult stage by those to whom “years have brought the philosophic mind,” and whom the experience of their own youth has taught that by which they may help others.

It lies upon those who are responsible for the bringing up of girls at this stage to see that circumstances are made as favourable as possible, that no unnecessary burden should be laid on those whose rapid development is making such heavy demands upon their strength.

The first condition of healthy growth is that it should be unconscious, and everything must be done to draw the girl's attention away from herself and her feelings, and to give her a healthy outlet for all her activities. Many a girl is the victim of the anxiety of a loving mother who makes her “run wild” for a year or two, or “do absolutely nothing with her mind” during the crucial time of adolescence. The consequence is that the mind, which refuses to do nothing, is

## PROBLEM OF ADOLESCENT GIRL 103

turned in upon itself and plays havoc with the imagination and the will, so that a neurotic condition ensues. "Health is the first consideration" comes almost automatically to the lips of many an anxious parent. The statement is questionable, since health is a means and not an end, but assuming that it is true that, at any rate, health must be considered first *in time*, it remains true that the direct pursuit of health is always fruitless, for in such a condition the girl

"Turned round upon herself and stands,  
Which, in the course of nature, is, to die."

Rather it is wise to fill the girl's life as full as may be with *interests* outside herself, carefully avoiding *excitement*, which is the last thing she needs. An interest to be pursued with steady aim, which takes her out of herself, will form an outlet for her activities; and since the mind is developing as well as the body, some such interests will be intellectual, if the normal activities are to be allowed full play. Therefore education should be looked upon not, as it so often is, as a tiresome demand which must to some extent be met at this age in spite of the risk to health which it involves, but as the greatest possible aid to healthy development. For this reason school, with its many and varied activities, balancing the intellectual with the social interests, calling upon a girl to throw herself into the corporate life, to subordinate her desires to the good of the whole body, to adjust herself to the claims of others, forms the best corrective to introspective tendencies. The girl who is quick to resent

restraints directed to her personally will accept as a matter of course the discipline which regulates the life of the society of which she finds herself a member; she will learn to do things because others do them, without regard to her own particular tastes; she will be inspired by enthusiasms and ambitions common to her and the rest of the school.

All this tends to effect that which we have seen is so necessary for a girl during the period of adolescence; it serves to check the tendency to self-centredness, to introspection, and "like a free flowing channel, dug and torn through the sour mud swamp of our existence" the work and the interest of the common life will serve to carry away the débris of morbid fancies.

The only way for powers to develop is by exercise: and just as the physical powers need well regulated and duly proportioned exercise, so do the mental and spiritual powers. The lower cells work better when the higher cells also are active.

But, of course, there are dangers in this full active school life. The stress may be too acute, the strain too heavy; emulation may degenerate into rivalry, ambition become merely personal; desire for the honour of the school may become a burden to the sensitive conscience. The new plan of what is somewhat loosely spoken of as "self-government" in schools, by which the responsibility for the order and discipline of the school is left to the girls themselves, acting through their elected representatives, may easily result in a strain on the conscientious girl, which produces

worry, and costs her more than all her work. The office of government involves the exercise of powers of judgment, in weighing evidence, in appreciating fine distinctions and finally forming irrevocable decisions; and these powers are not normally developed before maturity. Like all other faculties, these may be prematurely forced, but never without risk. We take care that the growing muscles shall not be asked to carry heavy weights; we should be at least as careful that the growing moral sense is not over-strained. Girls in their early teens should be responsible for no one but themselves: even the incentive of "setting a good example" should be used very sparingly.

All these dangers must be recognised; they can easily be guarded against by wise parents and teachers acting together. No girl's life should be so full as to leave no margin for expansion: she should have a reasonable amount of leisure in which she can move with freedom: she should be able, and encouraged, to pursue some hobby, independent of her school work. There is clearly something very ill-adjusted in the school life if the sixteen weeks of holiday cannot be used for this end. If they are needed for "complete rest" it must mean that the pace of school has been much too fast: if they are spent idly, just frittered away, it will mean not only a waste of life, but the probability of the girl becoming a prey to the listless or morbid fancies which, as we have seen, are likely to beset the vacant heart, especially at this stage. Any occupation of a creative nature,



whether carpentering, embroidery, dress-making, sketching, or other forms of hand-work, gives an opportunity for self-expression of the healthy kind, which is an outlet for activity, as opposed to the kind of self-expression which is only an intensification of self-assertion. The making of a "jumper" has been known to ward off a nervous breakdown.

If the school life is combined with that of the home, as it may be where a good day school is available, another set of interests, balancing and supplementing those of the school, are brought to bear upon the girl, affording what the school cannot give—the companionship, with the larger interests and complementary point of view, of the father and brothers, and, best of all, in some cases the call of the nursery, where absorption in self is an impossibility. It would be hard to exaggerate the value of this side of life in forming a girl's character, and especially in providing the healthy atmosphere in which a girl should breathe at this period of her life. It would be safe to say that it is never wholesome for any sex or age to associate only with its like, and especially is it unwholesome for adolescent girls to be almost entirely in the society of other girls with the same tendencies and difficulties at a time when a craving for sympathy is strongest. Girls inclined to be introspective and morbid, if thrown together in all their leisure time, are likely to indulge in confidences which confirm them in their fancies and grievances and "vapours." One will take the lead

“And all (her) store of sad experience (she)  
Lays bare of wretched days.  
Tells us (her) misery's birth and growth and signs  
And how the dying spark of hope was fed  
And how the breast was soothed, and how the head,  
And all (her) hourly varied anodynes.”

Worked up by this quite artificial description the

“Others pine  
And wish the long unquiet dream would end  
With close-lipped patience for our only friend,  
Sad patience, too near neighbour to despair.”

It is much more difficult to indulge in “close-lipped patience” in the rough-and-tumble of home life, where one is not taken exactly at one's own valuation, and has to put up with the interruptions and inconveniences inevitable in family life, than at boarding-school, where the routine of life is rightly arranged entirely to suit the needs of the girls.

When a girl lives at home her mother has the opportunity of keeping in close touch with her friends, and can prevent an undesirable intimacy and foster the wholesome friendships which are the richest fruits of school life and among the most important influences in the life of a girl. For without adopting the theory of the existence of hidden secrets poisoning the life of every girl, we may say without fear of contradiction that most girls need to be able at times to unburden their consciences, and bring their difficulties and fears and troubles into the light before some wise and sympathetic friend, who can, in the strict sense of the word, *comfort*, guide and brace them.

There is little doubt that some girls do suffer seriously, not only for the time, but permanently, from the want of such a confidante. It seems natural that the best confidante should be the girl's mother, and in some cases it is so, but I venture to think that in many more instances the girl finds this impossible even with—I had almost said especially with—the most ideal mother. Possibly it is the very closeness of the tie which brings about the paradoxical position that a girl finds it easier to confide in almost any other than her own mother, just as a shy girl will find it easier to explain her physical conditions to a professional nurse than to any of her own family. It seems intolerable to her to lay bare her inmost self to one with whom she lives so closely. Be this as it may, it often happens, sometimes to the grief of the good mother, who takes it as a sign that she has failed to win her child's love, that a girl will find it more helpful to open her self out to a comparative stranger, very often a mistress in her school, one whom she has invested with a halo of impossible virtues and boundless wisdom. Whether this hero-worship, almost invariably incidental to the adolescent stage, is to be wholesome or the reverse, depends almost entirely upon the character of the woman who is the object of it, and the mother who has to resign herself to let another take her girl's confidence can at least see that it is someone whom she can trust and respect, however difficult it may be for her to view her in the light in which the child's imagination has surrounded her heroine. A complete under-

standing between the mother and the mistress will not involve any breach of the child's confidence, but will help both to deal wisely and tenderly with the sensitive unbalanced creature. A wise woman, far from dissecting the character of her pupil and treating her as a pathological study, will firmly check all excessive self-exposure, will touch with a light hand, probably with a little discreet chaff, the extravagance and absurdities of the young girl, and yet know how to give the sympathy needed in real difficulty and mental suffering. In most cases, sacramental confession, not too frequent, will be found the most natural and helpful relief to the oppressed mind. Part of the burden is quite sure to be moral, and beyond the profound relief of the assurance of forgiveness, is the security arising from the knowledge that the help has come through the divinely appointed channel, and that there is no possibility of the confidence being betrayed. It avoids the not uncommon danger of a girl finding a perverse pleasure in lamenting with much self-pity some of her faults—those of which she is not really ashamed—while deceiving herself as to the real mischief.

But beside the moral problems there are often intellectual and other difficulties besetting the girl who is learning life. Perplexities arising from the child beginning to realise something of the mysteries of nature, and the complexities of social life; wounds to sensitive feelings and shocks to the sense of what is seemly all call for the help of a veritable Barnabas—a son (or daughter) of consolation, of encouragement, of exhortation.

What will the "virtuous woman" have to offer to her disciple?

There exists to-day a widespread theory that all the troubles of adolescence arise from sex-consciousness, and that what is needed is frank and full explanations of the meaning and implications of sex. The exponents of this theory are not content that we should give, at the appropriate time, simple explanations of the fundamental facts as to motherhood, but would break down all barriers of reserve, which they stigmatise as "Victorian prudery" and substitute for a "conspiracy of silence" a publicity campaign. It is doubtless true that many mothers, and those who in some cases are called upon to take the place of mothers, err in not giving quite simply and reverently, the teaching as to the beginnings of life which can be given to a child by a mother, or other responsible woman, without shocking or disturbing her; so as to prevent a natural curiosity being satisfied by illicit enquiries. But I believe that an error even more serious in its consequences is being committed by those who go to the opposite extreme. They urge that it is useless to "make a mystery" about the beginnings of life; but there is no question of *making* a mystery; it is there, as those know well who have most understanding of it, and the mistake lies in ignoring the fact of mystery and violating the natural instinct of reserve with regard to it. The argument that such reserve is "conventional" is not final. Conventions in their right place have their uses: often they enshrine the wisdom and experience of the race. It was

a wise man who wrote "He that breaketh through a hedge, a serpent shall bite him," and the conventions that demand that girls should practise increasingly as they grow towards womanhood, habits of restraint in posture and movement, of dignity and reserve in regard to the other sex, and towards strangers, avoiding everything in behaviour or dress which would tend to attract attention, form a hedge round modesty, which itself is a hedge to purity. It is better to tell a little girl that certain ways of behaviour are to be avoided because they are "in bad taste," or because "*ces choses ne se font pas*," than to explain in detail the underlying reasons for the prohibition. Life and experience as they come will throw light upon the reasonableness of the conventions, for, as Plato says, "he that has been duly nurtured will have the keenest eye for defects, whether in the failures of art or the misgrowths of nature, and feeling a most just disdain for them, will commend beautiful objects and gladly receive them into his soul and feed upon them, and grow to be noble and good; whereas he will rightly censure and hate all repulsive objects, even in his childhood, before he is able to be reasoned with; and when reason comes he will welcome her most cordially who can recognise her by the instincts of relationship, because he has been thus nurtured."

To call attention to the physical facts of life more than is absolutely necessary is always a mistake. We are constantly told that the processes of generation are "so beautiful." Beautiful in the sense of adaptation of means to end they

may be ; so also are the processes of digestion, but few persons would be ready to speak of these as beautiful in the aesthetic sense, or to question the fact that attention to the digestive processes is in the last degree harmful to health. The beauty and the essence of motherhood lie not mainly in the bearing of children, but in the devotion, the patience, the understanding which make the real mother, and to direct the girls' thoughts and desires towards the development of these graces is the way to make them "dwell in a healthful region"; whereas the danger of letting the mind linger on the lower level is that sex impulses may be aroused which otherwise would lie dormant. "The practice of calling spades spades, and rarely talking about anything else," tends to keep one in the society of "the man with the muck-rake," when so much better and more really congenial society is awaiting us who, though formed of the dust of the earth, are made in the image of God.

Well intentioned efforts to acquaint girls with the horrors of vice and its disastrous physical consequences have resulted in not a few cases in producing in a girl the sense of having been outraged in her innermost feelings, and in some, of inducing a repulsion against everything connected with marriage and the bearing of children—which is certainly the last result desired by the mentor. The young have little sense of proportion ; to open their eyes too soon to the seamy side of life means to fill their whole mental horizon with the idea of the wickedness of the world, and to generate a distrust of human nature and an expectation of

evil which is assuredly not a "protection" against the evil. Nothing invites insult so certainly as self-consciousness betrayed in look or manner; while against assaults of passion the knowledge of suffering to follow avails nothing. The only security is to be found in the strength of habits of self-control, based on a deeply rooted conviction of duty—"How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?"

The friend and adviser who would use the opportunity to guide a girl through the stress of adolescence has then two main lines on which to move. Realising how the growing girl lacks balance, and is subject to two contrary tendencies—sometimes to resent control and fiercely to assert her independence, and at others to lean unduly on the support of others—she must try to help her

"Rapt in reverential awe

To sit self governed in the fiery prime of youth."

Self-control will be gained by the practice of the Greek principle of temperance, "nothing too much"; restraint of excessive laughter, of extravagant language; restraint of intemperate friendships and their outward expression; restraint in work, play, pleasure. Here again convention will be a help; "these things are not done" is sometimes the only check to unseemly behaviour to which an excited girl will respond; and one may be permitted to wish that some old conventions retained their force to-day. The modern standard of good breeding does not seem to demand of behaviour



“ . . . that repose  
That marks the caste of Vere de Vere,”

and forbids a girl to “let herself go” in the expression of her emotions, and complaints as to pain and discomfort. While we cannot regret the passing of the absurd affectation of a delicate appetite as appropriate to young ladies, yet, as the last tribute of hypocrisy to virtue, it at least showed that it was shameful to be greedy; and it is permissible to doubt whether the loud proclamation and indulgence of a very large appetite is an improvement on this older affectation; and whether it is desirable to rouse into activity the animal part of our nature by devouring large quantities of chocolate between the acts of a Shakespeare play, or when a Beethoven symphony has made an appeal to our higher spiritual faculties. Habits of self-indulgence so formed lay the foundations of habits of intemperance in other less harmless forms of sensuous enjoyment, and some of our older girls have learnt to smoke too much, to seek unwholesome excitement in gambling, and to injure health and character by indulgence in “cocktails.”

If in adolescence a girl learns to exercise self-control over the emotions and impulses which threaten to master her will, she will be prepared, when womanhood is reached, to confront its problems with the calmness gained by self-mastery.

But self-control must have a motive strong enough to compete with the headstrong desires which beset the unformed, un-stablished adolescent; and no motive will be found so strong as

that of firmly rooted religious principles. As we have seen, the adolescent girl tends sometimes to be emotionally, perhaps morbidly, religious, or, on the other hand, to be up in arms against all religious sanctions, and needs, in either case, to be dealt with very carefully. It would be useless, if it were not impossible, "to force religion" upon her: it will probably be wise not to insist rigidly on religious observances; but the wise and trusted friend may do much to bring religious influences to bear—by example, and, at favourable times, by moral suasion. We are often influenced unconsciously more by that which our friends take for granted and act upon, than by any argument; and that which a girl would perversely deny if presented to her as a formal proposition soaks into her subconsciousness and become a motive for action as the unspoken conviction of one whom she trusts and admires; or still more certainly, if it is the atmosphere of the home, however much she may be in revolt against it.

Much, too, will depend upon the training in childhood; and if confirmation has been administered during the peaceful period preceding adolescence, and the girl has learnt by experience the use of the Sacraments, she will be less likely to break away and will have a firmer hold upon their value than if confirmation has been deferred to the unsettled stage of adolescence. It is, just now, whether the girl recognises it or not, that the value of religion is to be tested. She needs, as we have seen, that which will "stablish, strengthen, settle" her. A sense of the worth-whileness of

life, often so dim at this stage, is supplied by the religious outlook on life as "*sub specie aeternitatis*," supplying a background and a reason for effort. "I can't see why I should give up my desires, should submit to such discipline," may be uttered vehemently, but there will be behind a half unconscious realisation that the reason for such self-abnegation may be in a region which transcends the visible and tangible. A faithful Creator, Who, having made, has a purpose for us, and is pledged to give the power to fulfil the purpose; Who, having endowed us with gifts, demands the return of these gifts in service, calls the unstable will to rise out of miserable uncertainty and weakness into action, which is the only possible solution of doubt.

The girl who has taken up a position of defiance against constituted authority often feels in her secret soul

"Me this unchartered freedom tires  
I feel the weight of chance desires."

and her innermost being finds support and rest in the sense of the binding force of religion. The thought "I must, I ought" gives a sense of relief when "I want to" has shown itself insufficient to satisfy her.

The oppressive sense of fears, too vague to be put into words, but casting a shadow on many a young life, will find comfort in the assurance of support and comfort.

"Underneath are the everlasting arms" comes as a stay to the mind just beginning to look out

on life and its dangers: and the panic-stricken terror of being lost in a crowd clings to the assurance "I have called thee by thy name—thou art Mine."

Most of all will the act of worship, the prostration of self before "the High and Holy One Who inhabiteth eternity" supply needs of the child feeling about for standing-room: and learning "If I lose myself I find myself."

In all that has been said, it is the normal girl passing through her quite natural stage of adolescence, who has been considered. There are, of course, others—abnormal girls, who need the doctor as well as the forces of home and school and friends—to bring them through their troubles.

The writer is conscious that her statements may sound dogmatic. But the paper gives confessedly a point of view, and there seemed little use in interspersing statements with such phrases as "I venture to think," or "it is my view," when the whole position is one of venturing to put forward a point of view, which, whether right or wrong, is the one reached by the writer after forty years of close contact with girls in the adolescent stage.

"The Republic of Plato," translated by Vaughan; "The Moral Life," Sorley; "The Spirit of Discipline," Francis Paget; "Creed and Character," Scott Holland; "The Dawn of Character," Mumford.

# COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE.

BY DR. MARY SCHARLIEB, C.B.E.

With reference to marriage St. Augustine writes, "Although I have thus thoroughly treated and sifted these matters, so far as my ability allows me, I nevertheless realise that the subject of marriage is most obscure and complicated ; nor do I venture to assert that either in this or in any other work I have yet unravelled all its entanglements, nor that if pressed I could even now do so." Thus wrote the great and learned Saint of the Western Church, and I do not see that more than fifteen hundred years later any of us are wiser or more successful in our handling of the difficult subject of marriage than was St. Augustine in A.D. 419. As to myself, with a long experience of life and after much reading of the authorities who have written on marriage, I must confess that I am but ill qualified for my task so far as theological and legal learning are concerned. My task must be a far humbler one. It is because I have had forty-six years of medical experience, besides that of my own courtship, betrothal, marriage and motherhood, I venture to give advice in this matter. A further reason for writing on the subject of marriage is the urgency of the people's need of instruction, and the hope that they may possibly have more tolerance for my simple words than they

have for the learned and majestic pages of great authors.

Marriage must be considered as it has existed in three epochs :—

(a) In the state of man's innocence before the Fall,

(b) As it existed among fallen men up to Pentecost, and

(c) As it has been from the day of the gift of the Holy Spirit to the present time.

In the beginning marriage was a divine institution, and in S. Matthew XIX. 4-7, we find Our Lord's words—"Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder." This pronouncement is recorded in practically the same words by S. Mark, x., 6-10.

After the Fall man rapidly declined from the moral perfection in which he was created, and slavery, polygamy, incest and divorce, spoiled marriage. He enslaved his brethren, taking the men as his bond labourers, and their women to be objects of his desire. Closely allied to this great wrong was the practice of polygamy, which virtually reduces woman to the condition of a slave. The man who stands to woman in the double relation of owner and of husband arrogates to himself the right to dispose of her as he will ;

but the woman has no rights, she is not even mistress of her own body. We know that incest was common from very early times, for instance, Abraham married his half-sister, Sarah, and we find no record of shame or of punishment although he was rebuked by Abimelech. On a level with these morals was the common practice whereby a man could divorce his wife not only for adultery but even for neglect of his interests, his happiness, and for other minor reasons.

Against all this laxity and wrong, Moses, that supremely wise lawgiver and admirable minister of public health strove, and not ineffectually. He introduced wise restrictions on polygamy, he provided that there should be an equality among a man's wives; that a man should acknowledge his first-born son as his heir even although he might be the child of an unloved wife; that no man should have more wives than could be comfortably and adequately supported; that the High Priest should have but one wife, taking her to himself as a virgin; and that the king should be mindful of his obligations and not multiply wives unto himself.

The laws passed by Moses entailed heavy punishment on the practice of incest; with regard to divorce, he checked this common offence by imposing onerous legal formalities which tended to eliminate both haste and recklessness, and he limited it to cases of adultery only. Our Lord's commentary on this legislation was—"Moses because of the hardness of your heart suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, whosoever shall

put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her that is put away doth commit adultery." Thus runs the record of S. Matthew; the Jewish Gospel, quoting the legislation of Moses which was not ideal in that wise lawgiver's eyes but was permitted by him on account of the hardness of his people's hearts. S. Mark's Gospel written for the Gentiles, and probably backed by a more correct version, simply says, (chap. X, 11-12) "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her, and if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." And yet again we find in S. Luke (S. Luke, XVI. 18) "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."

What Moses permitted seems to have been a decree of nullity of marriage. When ante-nuptial unchastity of the woman was proven it was a fraud on the husband who had married her believing her to be a virgin. We find no sanction in the law of Moses for re-marriage after divorce; according to his law the divorcée could not be taken back by her first husband nor could she lawfully marry another man.

### MARRIAGE IN THE TIME OF OUR LORD

In those later days marriage was regarded by the Jews as a civil contract which might, or might not, be celebrated with religious ceremonies, and



by this time the Romans, who were a law loving and law abiding people, had seriously fallen from their old strictness and purity with reference to marriage. We learn from Foerster—"Under the old republic the national conscience would have been shocked by the freedom of divorce but the contagion of immorality spread so rapidly during the later republic, that the perpetual obligation of marriage was no longer heard of and men like Cato and Cicero felt no scruple in putting away their wives."

How did Christ deal with the prevailing laxity of morals? He appealed to the original law, which, as we have seen, was one of perpetual obligation, and in giving private instruction to His own disciples who asked Him to explain this difficult question, He said quite clearly, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her, and if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery." (S. Mark, X. 11-12).

S. Paul was among the earliest Christian writers on the subject of marriage and we find him expressing himself very clearly. Thus, "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she shall be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but

if her husband be dead, she is free from that law ; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man." (Romans VII, 1-4.) And again—"Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord. Let not the wife depart from her husband : but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband ; and let not the husband put away his wife." (1 Cor. VII, 10-11.) Lastly in writing to the Ephesians S. Paul gives us the famous passage which occurs in our marriage service as an exhortation to husbands. From this two verses at least must be quoted—"For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery : but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." (Eph. V, 25 to end.)

From that time to the present day two views of marriage have existed. 1. The truly Christian view which looks on it as a holy estate, as an indissoluble bond, and a sacrament which confers grace and demands obedience to a standard of duty. 2. The non-Christian view which regards marriage as a civil contract conditioned by the laws of the State, dissoluble at pleasure and as a mere ceremony by which grace is not conferred and by which no duties are entailed.

### WHAT IS NATURAL MARRIAGE?

The essence of natural marriage is the union of a man and a woman by free consent with or without religious ceremonies. Such a marriage is a contract, and the value received by each party is the posses-

sion of the partner's body. Such a marriage may be upheld by the civil law of the State in which it is contracted, it is undoubtedly an influence for good in the lives of the partners, but it does not partake of the nature of a sacrament, it does not convey special grace, and it is often regarded as dissoluble, but according to the Fathers of the Church this view was erroneous and all marriage was to be held sacred. As Mortimer very well puts it—"Matrimony may be regarded as an act or as a state. As an act natural marriage may be viewed as the legitimate contract by which a man and woman who are capable of doing so mutually give each other power over his or her body for the purpose of the procreation of offspring, and bind themselves to an undivided partnership for life. In the second sense, that is to say as a state, it is very frequently called the *vinculum* or bond of matrimony."

#### WHAT IS CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE ?

Christian marriage is the union of a baptised man and a baptised woman by free consent. It is entered upon by parties capable by age and by status of giving such consent, and thus a valid contract is made, the consideration of which is the yielding to each other of their mutual persons. This contract is ratified by the consummation of marriage, that is by the act of union. Under these conditions Christian marriage is complete, but although the man and the woman marry each other Christian marriage is solemnised by the presence and the blessing of a priest "in the face

of God and of this congregation " as the marriage service says. The marriage contract is thus raised to the order of a sacrament whereby grace is conferred and power is given to the couple to live together according to God's ordinance, so that they are enabled, if they will use that grace, to meet the difficulties and the duties involved in their new relationship.

In this union of man and wife S. Paul sees, and we should all see, the type of our Lord's union with His Church. (Eph. v. 23, 32). To many of us the union of man and wife whereby they twain become one flesh, the union which consummates, ennobles, and purifies their mutual love is a reflection of the spiritual union between Christ and the individual soul. Considered from this point of view Christians cannot but feel that the marriage bond is indissoluble and sacred: that those couples who enter on this holy estate with due preparation of mind and spirit receive special grace to enable them to fulfil their mutual duties, and that those who thus enter into the closest union are indeed not two but one. Therefore the bond which unites a couple in Christian marriage is sacred and indissoluble. It is true that taken literally *character* is not conferred by Matrimony as it is by Baptism, Holy Orders, and Confirmation, but it is equally true that a change occurs in each Christian individual who is validly and lawfully married, whereby in a certain sense *character* is conferred because they never can again return to the virgin state. So long as both partners to the union live they are husband and wife: when one

of them dies the survivor enters a widowed estate and does not return to the unmarried status. This is as true as is the fact of the difference made by parenthood. A child being once born to a couple the parental and filial relation continue to exist. It is true that a child may be very disappointing, that all intercourse between parents and child may cease, but nothing can annul the fact that he is the child of his parents, and that they, who by reason of his birth, were made father and mother, must of necessity retain that relationship. The difference between this imperfect *character* and the perfect *character* conferred by certain sacraments is that in the one class, such as Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, nothing can alter the status of the subjects, whereas the physical relationship of husband and wife lasts only until death do them part. This fact is distinctly recognised in the marriage service of the Church of England in which the priest asks first the bridegroom and then the bride whether they will forsake all other so long as they both shall live, and immediately afterwards each partner promises the other that they will have and hold each other from that day forward until death do part them.\* Further, we remember for our comfort that although the children of the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as the angels of God, yet the spiritual tie and mystical union survive

\* It is not necessary to go further into the subject of the indissolubility of marriage because that is fully considered in another section of this book. We can now turn to the objects of marriage.

death, and the holy relationship, which was a support and comfort on earth, will be more perfectly enjoyed when we are delivered from the burden of the flesh and are conformed to the likeness of our Blessed Lord.

“Changed from glory unto glory  
Till in heaven we take our place,  
Till we cast our crowns before Him  
Lost in wonder, love and praise !” -

### THE OBJECTS OF MARRIAGE

The main objects of marriage are three in number. They are plainly set out in the Marriage Service of the Church of England.

1. Marriage is the gracious gift whereby mankind is increased and whereby the kingdom of God is populated.

“For dower of blessed children,  
For love and faith’s sweet sake,  
For high mysterious union  
That naught on earth can break.”

2. Marriage provides a sinless, appropriate, and blessed fulfilment of certain God-given instincts—the sexual and the parental.

3. Marriage is also designed for the mutual comfort and support that each partner should have of the other. This object finds a succinct and beautiful description in the designation ‘husband,’ which etymologically means the supporting band or tie of the house.

The first of these objects may be regarded as the altruistic element of the contract in that it

looks towards the greater glory of God and the maintenance of the Race.

The second object is self-regarding, the sanctification of man's natural desire for affection and for union with the partner of his choice.

And lastly, the third object provides for the satisfaction of the moral and intellectual natures of the man and wife, it is the answer to the divine pronouncement "it is not good for man to be alone." It is true that many lives are lived in loneliness, or at any rate without the dear and valued intimacy sanctioned by marriage. But good, holy and useful as such lives frequently are they must be regarded as exceptional, and as fulfilling the Divine law intellectually and morally, while for various reasons, not compassing a thoroughly normal physical existence.

#### HOW MAN HAS RESPONDED.

Mankind, both Christian and non-Christian, has made varied response to the objects proposed by the great Institutor of marriage. The Catholic Church instructs her children to make the most perfect response of which human nature is capable. They are led to accept marriage with all its difficulties and all its duties, relying simply on Divine grace to enable them to comply with the requirements of the holy estate. Marriage is to them the fore-ordained life by which they are to glorify God, and they recognise their earthly relations to each other as the true type of the relation existing between our Master and His

Church. To them it is given to know the joyous mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven. Another section of the Christian community live together according to God's ordinance in a simple common-sense manner, valuing their marriage, recognising the goodness of God in so securing and sanctifying their relation to each other, and discharging the duties entailed by that relationship, although unfortunately for them their life's pathway is not illumined by the mystic light which never was on sea or land but which makes the happiness of the first great division. The third class of couples can hardly be described by the adjective "Christian." Their lives are governed by selfish and material views, indeed they are pure hedonists, selfish and self-centred, eager for the pleasures and advantages of matrimony but heedless of the correlative duties.

The varying results of these responses are to be seen in the extraordinary happiness and satisfaction of those who sublimate the natural into the spiritual and who thus transmute earthly into heavenly love. The second class who sow the seed of common-sense and simple devotion to duty are sure to reap an appropriate harvest whereas, alas, one would fain open the eyes of the third class to the fact that habits end in the formation of character, and that according to our characters so is our destiny. It is all too true that "those who sow to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption," that is, the ruin and the loss of the pleasure they seek ardently but in vain.



## PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE.

Marriage more than any other relationship in life urgently needs preparation and the restraint of an "outside conscience" because there is none other which is so greatly under the influence of so tremendous a force as is the sexual passion. This instinct, although God-given, has suffered great perversion. It has been transformed from a natural and health-giving instinct into a blind and imperious tyrant. This tyrant is one which can readily become a slave driver and an incarnation of necessity when once the spirit and the will have abdicated their position as rulers. As Foerster tells us, reckless determination to enjoy self-expression and unlimited sexual liberty spells chaos, and married life under such circumstances is justly compared by him to the disruption of a sphere and the perilous course of its scattering fragments. This is why right and sane views of the objects and duties of matrimony should be ingrained into the consciousness of those who intend to marry.

In this very serious matter it is a mistake to think that there is anything to choose between the responsibility of young men and young women. It is fatal to take a one-sided view, and while it is contrary to fact to assert that men are always responsible for the wrong standard set up in their home, it is equally false to place an unfair share of the blame on the women. The large amount of literature dealing with marriage and other sexual

problems at the present time shows that both men and women all too frequently fall short of their duty not only as to their private practice but as to the advice and moral instruction which they offer to the public. For instance some of the best known exponents of the theory that passionate love is the only sanction for marriage, and that when love and marriage cease to co-exist the obligations of marriage cease also, give the same erroneous lead to those who are attracted by the style of their writing and by their very obvious sympathy with the sorrows and troubles which are apt to make life difficult. To all this must be added the gross materialism of the age which impels many people to a selfish seeking for physical comfort, for wealth and all that wealth represents—the worship of intellect, the disregard of character, and the fatal ignoring of the spiritual side of our nature with its imperious demands for cultivation and nurture.

Preparation for marriage in the case of any individual couple ought to have commenced before their personal lives began, because the make-up of body, mind, and moral nature depends largely on what their parents were. The two great influences which determine health or unhealthiness are heredity and environment. This is illustrated by the peculiarities of appearance constitution, and mental characteristics which are frequently repeated generation after generation. Sometimes it happens that an individual seems to have derived but little from either father or mother but he bears a striking resemblance to one of his

four grandparents or to some other member of the family even more distant than these.

In recognising the tremendous influence of heredity we must be careful not to minimise the equally important influence of environment, for although individuals come into the world bearing the family stamp and reproducing family characteristics still environment counts for much in the final make up of personality, and not unfrequently environment is able to so modify original characteristics as to make the adult form a strong variation from the family type. For example, take the case of the influence of at any rate two out of the three great racial poisons. Experiments on animals and observations on human subjects lead irresistibly to the conclusion that alcoholism has a very evil influence on the germ and sperm cells, so that in many instances of alcoholics, there is no capacity for procreating viable children or although young may be produced alive the numbers in the litters are smaller than is normal and a considerable percentage of live-births consist of young far below the normal standard of health and intelligence, and occasionally in the birth of individuals, who show some great deformity or malformation.

Individuals born of alcoholic parents may, and in some cases do, show the results of inheritance, in being themselves less apt for generation, or less able to produce fine and vigorous offspring. In this connection should be remembered the observation of Sir Thomas Clouston who found that the daughters of drunkards were usually unable to suckle their babies, showing a deviation from the

normal; very important as giving evidence of their own defectiveness, very important also as being a handicap to the vitality and the well-being of their offspring.

In the case of syphilis, children born to syphilitic parents in cases where treatment has been neglected or ineffectual enter upon life maimed, and after a stormy infancy are apt to become blind, deaf, or mentally unsound as they develop. Later in youth, during adolescence, such children may show the effect of their sad inheritance in some of the later manifestations of the disease which chiefly affect the brain and the nerves. It is probable that the surviving children of a syphilitic family are less robust, less virile, and that they may possibly hand on the taint to their own children should they marry. On the other hand the environment of an alcoholic home is a powerful influence for evil on the unfortunate children brought up in it: the want, the squalor, and the poor morale, of the home where father or mother are alcoholics, effectually prevent their satisfactory development. On the other hand, children of alcoholic parents removed from their care during their early infancy, and brought up in a normal home by satisfactory foster-parents, may, and apparently often do, escape the physical and moral taint. In like manner a syphilitic child promptly and suitably treated, and removed from all risk of reinfection, may grow up healthy.

It is evident therefore that preparation for marriage, good or bad, begins long before the lives of the individual couple, and that it presupposes attention to the physical, moral and spiritual health

of the grandparents and great grandparents and also a constant watchfulness over the family circumstances. Such ideal preparation is rare and of course it is not consciously made. It is only as the nation gradually realises its responsibility, and as sin, disease, and dirt, are effectually combated, that we can expect the majority of couples to be properly prepared for a holy and a happy union. For years to come those who are interested in eugenics, temperance, and chastity, will be as voices crying in the wilderness: they must be contented to bear witness to the truth, to do what is possible, and to strive and pray for what is not to be accomplished immediately. Every effort, no matter how small, has its result, and the workers must be contented to persevere even although the result of their labour is no more obvious than is that of the coral polyp.

At the present time preparation for marriage, whether conscious or unconscious, is much neglected and can hardly be said to exist. Marriages are all too frequently made on the simple basis of mutual attraction, or are the results of apparently casual meetings. The girl is perhaps considered pretty or bright, the young man has the charm of youth and has no doubt something which attracts the girl, but the whole influence is extremely vague and were it not backed up by the general sexual desire of young people the attraction would not be sufficiently powerful to effect more than a passing interest. As it is, it is frequently taken as the basis of what ought to be a life-long partnership. In a slightly different class of marriages the basis

afforded by this physical attraction is backed up and reinforced by a community of social status, of tastes, pursuits, and possibly even of religious and political views. Such a choice is not founded on a sufficiently broad and stable basis, there is little or no endeavour to ascertain whether the qualities and tastes which suffice to make them good friends and playfellows are sufficient to stand the stress of the difficulties and sorrows of life. The fact that they have similar tastes, and that they both play the same games, or that they have similar musical and artistic views will not suffice to help them to put up with each other's shortcomings nor with the mutual stress of conflicting opinions in more serious matters such as the housing question, the difficulties of making both ends meet, and the rainy days of sickness, depression, and general dissatisfaction, which come to all of us sooner or later.

Much disillusionment must follow when the lapse of time and the difficulties of life show that all was not gold that glittered, that the charming girl is not a perfect housekeeper, not a wise mother, not even a patient and long-suffering wife. Similarly the young woman finds it hard to believe that the fascinating and apparently adequate partner at golf and tennis, of the orchestra or study circle, is all too readily bored when she is not well and bright, and that he has indeed taken her for well and for better, for richer and richer, but not for richer and poorer, for sickness as well as for health. In many instances worse discoveries than these are made, and the unhappy young people are disposed to blame each other, to blame fate, and indeed every-

one and everything except their own haste and recklessness.

### COURTSHIP.

The time of courtship ought to afford an opportunity for young people to learn the essential facts about each other. After marriage suspicions and jealousies are worse than useless, but during the engagement or courtship young couples cannot be too much on the alert in their endeavour to understand each other and to form a just estimate of what they have to expect should the engagement run its natural course to matrimony. Courtship is not only a time of probation, it is also a time of very considerable danger. The young people are left much to themselves, they view each other in a rosy light, and under conditions of almost unbroken sunshine: every arrangement is made by their friends to enable them to acquire a sufficient knowledge of each other, to compare tastes, views, and opinions, and also it may be to learn each other's temperaments, to appreciate the strong and the weak points of their mutual characters, and to come to some understanding as to the scope and tendencies of the life that is in immediate prospect for them.

The wiser sort of young people consider with some care what their income is likely to be and what style of home they are justified in arranging. The father, or other guardian of the girl, interviews the young man with reference to his position and prospects in life and probably makes some discreet

enquiries of mutual friends as to his financial and social soundness, but too often insufficient stress is laid on whether the young people are suited to each other by an accordance of their views on the graver matters of life, whether they are not only likely to be successful as husband and wife but also as father and mother, and the very important question as to health and heredity is frequently ignored. This is one of the occasions in which the dual standard of morals for men and women comes in with disastrous effect. Everyone rightly and properly expects that the girl shall go virgin to the altar, but the expectation that the bridegroom shall have led an equally pure and satisfactory life is not common, and in the opinion of many people the demand for such a standard of morals in the case of men is thought to be absurd. There is at the present time a very considerable demand for what is called the equality of the sexes, but if this equality is to be purchased at the cost of lowering the standard of morals for women the change will be for the worse and not for the better of the human race. The age-long demand that a woman shall exercise self-restraint not only in sexual matters but in minor matters also has been one of the most important influences in maintaining the stability of civilised life. If once it were generally held that women also should seek only self-realisation and self-pleasing the death knell of civilised society as understood by us will have sounded.

In many states of America mutual certificates of health and good morals are demanded: the plan has much to commend it, and if it became general



it would probably afford a considerable safeguard against undesirable unions.

Courtship and betrothal should be looked on as the novitiate of marriage, it should emphasise the new relationship in which the betrothed lovers are about to stand with regard to each other. Solemnity and impressiveness might well be added and could be easily enforced by a church service and the exchange of engagement rings. The betrothed couple should be looked upon as under a solemn promise to each other, and as bound to be mutually helpful in furthering preparations for the sanction of matrimony, it should lay emphasis on their new relationship, it should set them apart in the eyes of their families and friends, but it should not be looked upon as a sanction for any undue familiarity.

#### DIFFICULTIES OF EARLY MARRIED LIFE.

Difficulties spring up all too readily and too quickly after marriage. Sometimes an over-long honeymoon enhances the difficulty. The bridegroom almost certainly has some steady employment, which, as a rule, brings him the necessary interest and variety of employment, and which supports him morally by giving him a rule of life and an outside conscience. Thus he is accustomed to getting up at a regular time, having his breakfast by the clock, and taking day after day the usual train or omnibus to business. All through the day certain duties have to be performed, a certain order has to be maintained, and undoubtedly the sense

of sharing in the law and order of the great working world is a support and a comfort. The girl, too, has probably had various duties, and if she were fortunate, these duties provided her also with a backbone for her life. During the honeymoon neither bride nor bridegroom have any necessary work: if they are wise they have an intelligent scheme for the spending of their holiday, but if they are unwise there is nothing definite, and the summer days are spent in pleasant outdoor lounging, or the winter afternoons by the fireside, perhaps with the relief of the piano. Of course they think and expect that they will be so engrossed with each other that they will need no other employment than that charming one known as "making love." Alas, a diet of strawberries and cream with much sugar quickly leads to nausea.

With the return from the honeymoon and the settling down to ordinary everyday life young couples soon realise that "the roseate hues of early dawn" must quickly fade away, and that the delightful mist which softened their mutual imperfections to each other's eyes during courtship will not last through the heat, the glare, and the toil of married life. They realise as they never did before the import of differences of temperament, different habits of life, and the tremendous influence of divergent political and religious views, especially when such views are strongly and conscientiously held. In order that marriage may be peaceful, happy, and blessed, young couples should remember the inherent imperfection of all human beings and of all human environment. It is well for each to

cherish ideals, but it is well also for them to remember that ideals are something to live up to but which are only to be attained by long years of discipline and toil. The young people must try to realise that they are not angels, (and only potentially saints) that they could not possibly have perfected their characters, and that one of the blessings that they have a right to expect through the sacrament of marriage is mutual help towards the realization of their high standard. To promote this they must strive to cultivate patience, candour and politeness in their everyday life, and they must look to their beloved intimacy and life of union with each other to help them to bear the inevitable shocks, difficulties and misunderstandings that are bound to occur. Beyond all, if they are wise and realise the tremendous importance of character-building and soul-developing in their new relationship they will remember that nothing but the grace conferred by the sacrament of marriage can suffice to carry them through all these difficulties. Misunderstandings are sure to arise but quarrels should never occur; they are a treason to love.

It is true that men and women should never marry without a real respect for each other, but it is equally true that a marriage founded on respect alone is insecurely grounded. The deep and powerful passion of love is the great resolver of all difficulties.

“Love rules the court, the camp, the grove.  
And men below and saints above,  
For love is heaven, and heaven is love.”

Young couples should consider very carefully the influence that their environment must have on the development of their characters and on the attainment of their ideals. The question of poverty or riches and the question of high or low station in life do not enter into the matter at all, but the careful arrangement of life so that there is a constant gentle pressure of duty and responsibility is all-important and anything which teaches them unselfishness and gives them a wide outlook on life is of great importance. The best influence of all comes from the possession and love of children. It has to be remembered that with the arrival of the first baby certain new elements in character appear both in husband and in wife. The parental instinct is one of the most powerful of all instincts, and whereas it is possible for husband and wife to live in a sort of double selfishness, the gift of a child opens out to them a whole group of new responsibilities and joys. It is no longer possible for them to live in the present, they are compelled to take the future into account, and everything must be done with reference to the welfare, maintenance, and education of the children, and unless the parental instinct develops awry it cannot but be a powerful influence for good and a completion and rounding out of character.

Another circumstance that must be carefully considered and wisely dealt with is the influence of the "in-laws." It is all very well to say that a man does not marry his wife's family, or vice versâ, but as a fact their influence cannot but be felt, and it is the height of folly for a man to marry a

girl when he feels that those who are dear to her from childhood, for whom she cherishes respect and love, and who will always have more or less influence over her, are just the people who for some reason or non-reason are entirely repugnant to him. No doubt the young couple must leave their father and mother and cleave to each other—they ought to do so—but the strain caused by divergence of aims, characters and opinions, may be so great as to become intolerable, and even in cases where there is the truest allegiance between the young people much stress and difficulty will surely arise if there is no *entente cordiale* with their mutual parents.

After a time the small acute trials of early married life tend to become chronic, and unless husband and wife maintain the freshness of their love, and remember to treat each other with due courtesy a very intolerable position may develop; too much will be taken for granted, and the absence of the little attentions, the helpful caresses and mutual understanding, is apt to eat out the very heart of their life's rose. As a matter of fact, where there are children, new mutual interests are continually developing, and new joys constantly appear, but where there are no children there is much tendency to selfishness and to a grey monotony which is almost more destructive to happiness than occasional fits of temper. Both husband and wife should be careful to maintain mutual interests and to develop a circle of real friends.

The most intimate relations of married life must

always be a matter of deep concern to both husband and wife. The principles upon which matrimonial happiness can be based are well expounded by S. Paul, who tells them to exercise "due benevolence," and who admonishes them thus:—"defraud ye not one the other except it be with consent for a time that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayers and come together again," in order that the objects of marriage may be fulfilled, and that they may derive from this intimacy such mutual comfort and support as shall be a real influence for good on every part of their triune nature.

The difficult question of the limitation or spacing of the family is considered by Sir Arthur Newsholme in another section of this book (see Section III., pp. 147-172). I will therefore content myself here with saying that an ideal marriage involves fruition, and that no domestic happiness is complete without the presence of children.

The parents' place and duty in the education of their children begins not only before the birth of the child but in their own young days, but that part of the subject has already been considered under the heading of "Preparation for Marriage." There is, however, a time between the birth of a child and its attainment of school age during which the active responsibility for its welfare and development rests on its parents, and chiefly on its mother. This involves the provision of nourishment, clothes, and warmth, and without going into any details it is well to remark that the only right and suitable food for an infant is its mother's milk. The

chances of life as enjoyed by the breast-fed child are of twice the value of those which fall to the lot of the bottle-fed baby.

The mother's duty towards her child is not exhausted by her devoted care of its body. The most lasting impressions are those which are made before the seventh year, and generally speaking by that age the outlines of the health and character of the future man are sketched out. It is the mother who ought to give, and who is the most competent to give, the early instruction which is responsible for the child's religion, for his patriotism, and for the justice of his relationships with parents, brothers, sisters, and friends. It is the mother who ought to teach him the Bible stories, the folk-lore, the time-honoured fairy-tales and nursery rhymes which have done so much to make our nation what it is. It is from his mother that the child ought to learn the happiness of employment, the misery of idleness, and by her too, chiefly by her example, he must be taught with what extraordinary accuracy our good and evil deeds secure their appropriate rewards and consequences. (See Section I. by Col. Shirley).

In the mutual management of their children husband and wife should be careful to pull together and to enforce each other's orders. Even when they do not see eye to eye it is wise to act for the moment as if they did, and instead of letting the child see that there is a difference of opinion the parent appealed to should always loyally enforce the orders of the other: the matter can be adjusted between them subsequently in private. Nothing is worse for a child's character than for him to

discover that he can play off one parent against the other and that there is at any rate a chance of successful appeal against an order.

The principle of unity upon which this advice is founded does not only apply to the management of the children but also to the care that husband and wife should take not to fritter away their social influence and value by letting their friends see that there are differences of opinion between them, it is wrong as well as undignified and galling to display these differences in public. As a rule, where husbands and wives are sincerely true to each other, there is a gradual adjustment of their views, and each remembers that although everything is not according to individual wishes it is quite certain that the opposite number has also something to complain of. And so with increased experience and with a deeper comprehension of each other's nature, of their strong points and their weak points, there is a constantly increasing and deepening unity, the sure reward of tact, unselfishness and mutual forbearance. There is, there must be, a yoke in marriage, but this yoke is not unbearably heavy, and gradually the shoulders that bear it adjust it so that it is not intolerable, and even in those sad cases where there has never been any true marriage of the two spirits, and where, therefore, there is a constant difficulty in maintaining peace, the sufferers should remember that the loss to them and to the children which would be incurred by separation would be far worse. As the old Geeks said "*pathemata mathemata*," "our sorrows are our lessons," and we know that wrongs



and griefs may by divine grace be transmuted into useful discipline, so that as character develops there will be increased ability not only to sympathise with, and to understand each other, but also that sorrow and difficulty bravely borne become a real training which gradually fits them to help other people. Everyone must learn in suffering what he hopes to teach in song.

Another consideration for people who have a difficult married life is that even an erring partner has a very real claim on forbearance and makes a valid demand for help. And after all if there be no remedy, and if no amelioration be possible, it is the wisest part to embrace the sorrow as a means of purgation, to possess one's soul in patience, looking to the end for the reward. Individuals in such bitter trouble should be reluctant and chary of consulting friends and in discussing difficulties, with members of the family. The first and the best confidante and helper should be God, and great endeavours should be made so to bear the troubles and difficulties of life as to avoid the crowning disaster of seeking unhallowed relief. We have none of us any right to expect that all our seas will be smooth and all our weather golden, but we must learn that happiness is not a thing to be grasped at, rather is it a result which infallibly crowns cheerful and patient endurance.

"Holy Matrimony," Kelly; "Psychology of Marriage," Le. Gallichan; "Evolution of Marriage," Letourneau; "History of Marriage," Luckock.

# THE CONTROL OF CONCEPTION

BY SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, K.C.B., M.D.

IN nearly all parts of the British Empire, in Europe—especially west of Russia and Hungary—and in America, the control of conception as a means of securing limited families has become a common practice; and the reasons for this practice and its probable effects on the characteristics and the distribution of mankind form a supremely important study in the history of civilization. The practice of conception-control has become commonly known as birth-control, a term which is generally avoided in this chapter, as it might also denote the practice of abortion of the products of conception, which besides being illegal is condemned as anti-social by all schools of thought alike.

Some of the facts as to the remarkable *reduction of the birth-rate* in most civilized countries may be briefly indicated. The conditions during the great war were so abnormal that comparisons of two periods before the war are preferred. In 1871-80 the annual birth-rate in England and Wales averaged 35.4 per 1,000 of population; in 1911-13 it had become 24.1. In France the birth-rate in

1860 was 26.2—already low—in 1913 it had become 19.0 per 1,000. In Prussia it varied between 35 and 38 until 1903; in 1912 it had become 28.9. In Italy it was nearly always over 35.0 before 1895, in 1912 it was 32.4. The Australian birth-rate was about 35 until 1891, it had become 28.2 in 1913. In contrast with these the crude \* birth-rate of Ireland was 24.5 in 1881, and 23.1 in 1901.

**EFFECT OF REDUCED BIRTH-RATE ON POPULATION.**—The increase of the population of a country, apart from migration, depends on the excess of births over deaths. In recent years a remarkable decline in the death-rate has occurred, which has practically counter-balanced the lowered birth-rate, so far as increase of population is concerned. Evidently this cannot continue indefinitely, and already the population of England and Wales is increasing to a steadily decreasing extent. Thus in the decade 1871-81 the population increased by natural increase—i.e., by excess of births over deaths—to the extent of 15.1 per cent; in 1901-11 the corresponding increase in ten years was 12.4 per cent; and in 1911-21 it was only 8.4 per cent. That the circumstances of war and resultant interference with married life were only partially responsible for the last-named figure may be

\* The population of Ireland consists to a much larger extent than that of the other countries named above of women not of child-bearing age, and among these the number married is relatively small. But when "corrected" figures are obtained there is equally little evidence of decline in the Irish birth-rate.

inferred from a comparison between the birth-rates of 1871-80 and of 1911-13 respectively when applied to the population (37,885,242) of England and Wales in 1921. With a birth-rate of 24.1, as in 1911-13, the births would have numbered 776,634; with a birth-rate of 35.4 as in 1871-80, they would have been 1,344,926, a difference of 564,504. Thus in a single year the reduced birth-rate implied a loss in deficiency of births, which in less than two years would have replaced in numbers those individuals lost in the Great War. To many this will be the subject of rejoicing rather than of regret; but whatever view be taken, a study of the means which have led to this result, and of the reasons for the adoption of means to this end has immense communal importance.

CAUSES OF REDUCED BIRTH-RATE.—The various views held as to the causes of the reduced birth-rate I have fully discussed elsewhere.\* Here it suffices to say that postponement of marriage accounts for only a minute proportion of the change, and that there has been no decrease in the proportion of the total population who enter into matrimony. It has been suggested that physiological cycles in national or international fertility occur; but the evidence on this point is inconclusive, and the hypothesis is not confirmed by the strikingly contrasted birth-rates of catholic and non-catholic populations, as shown, for instance, in French and English Canada, and in Ireland and England.

\* Elements of Vital Statistics, chap. IX and X, by A. Newsholme. New ed. 1921. (Geo. Allen & Unwin).

Economic conditions probably influence the birth-rate, but this influence operates indirectly, and in the main implies contraceptive practices to render it effective. Other than directly economic motives are in action, the motives behind the reduced birth-rate varying in different social circles : but whatever the motives the change in the birth-rate is due largely and probably chiefly to the use of contraceptive agents. That this is so is indicated by converging lines of evidence. Thus in England the decline in the birth-rate began in 1877, a year in which the Bradlaugh-Besant prosecution gave wide publicity to "The Fruits of Philosophy" a pamphlet describing methods of conception-control, and this decline has continued steadily to the present time. The reduction has coincided with the increasing publicity given to anti-conception procedures and the sale of appliances to this end. It has occurred especially among the "intelligensia" and the more intelligent artisans, though both knowledge and practice are becoming more and more general. The reduced birth-rate has not occurred—or only to a minor extent—among practising Roman Catholics, who are forbidden to use contraceptives. And, in general, the attempt to associate the differential reduction of the birth-rate in this and other countries with any factor other than that of the use of contraceptives has completely failed.

**MOTIVES OF CONTRACEPTION.**—The outstanding feature of what may not extravagantly be described as a progressive strike against parentage, is the real or supposed conflict between the personal and

family outlook, and the national or imperial point of view. That the family outlook is not regarded as inimical to the communal outlook, or that a large part of the population ignore the communal outlook, is shown by the fact that without decrease of the marriage-rate and with but a small increase in the mean age at marriage, the contribution of a large and increasing proportion of total marriages to replenishment of the population is becoming less and less. This partial strike against parentage is shown not only in families of three and four children, which cannot be regarded as completely normal, but also in the increase of one-child and of no-child families, coinciding in time with the use of contraceptives.

RELATION TO THE MALTHUSIAN HYPOTHESIS.—The refusal of parentage may be justified by the view contrary to the course of events in this country—that population tends to increase at a higher rate than means of subsistence. Malthus described Scotland with a population of two millions as “certainly over-peopled,” but experience has shown that this was not so; and that in Adam Smith’s words, “the most decisive mark of the prosperity of any country is the increase of the number of its inhabitants.” It will be agreed that the verification of Malthusian pessimism has been at least postponed; but it may be urged that the pressure of population on means of subsistence must eventually occur, given a continuous birth-rate exceeding the death-rate; and that in fact the great European War

may be traced to the struggle of superabundant populations for their economic "place in the sun." Even if this most debateable point be granted, it is clear that the financial prosperity of England depends on its foreign trade and still more on the growth of the populations of the world-wide commonwealths of the British Empire and on the interchange of trade between them and the mother-country; and that until these commonwealths are peopled, and preferably by a British population, it will be lamentable if by default of family life the vast empty areas are filled by southern and eastern races, with a civilization vastly different from if not inconsistent with ours. In England there are some 700 persons to the square mile; in Canada and Australia only some 2 or 3 persons in the same area; and *migration* on a vastly increased scale is needed in the interest not only of Great Britain but of every part of the British Empire. A really statesman-like outlook, on the part not only of the British Government, but even more on the part of the self-governing commonwealths of the empire, directed to the encouragement of mutual helpfulness in the settlement of families wherever they are lacking, with a view to the formation of communities, is a much more urgent need than the present indiscriminate propaganda in favour of conception-control, which is likely to be practised especially by those who, in most instances, would be benefited morally and socially by larger families.

INTERNATIONAL STANDPOINT.—Nor can the

restriction of families in English-speaking countries be regarded without dismay. The following extract \* states the problem as it appears to me :

“ Personal and family comfort are increased by a limited family ; but nationally this is no compensation, for instance to France, whose stationary population is replenished from outside nations. As the international situation is at present developing, Germany is following the example of France and England in control of its birth-rate. There is little evidence so far of progress of this movement eastward, and the next few generations may see an increasing preponderance in Europe of Slavonic people, with a large admixture of Asiatic blood. In America similar and even more striking changes are occurring. The native-born Americans, chiefly of Anglo-Saxon origin, have a birth-rate which commonly exceeds but little the death-rate ; while the American continent is being populated in an increasing proportion by immigrants and Americans of Celtic origin or by immigrants who are derived from eastern and southern Europe, and by a large Hebraic contingent.

“ Forecasts are notoriously untrustworthy ; but if the present policy of large restriction of families becomes universal in western communities, our present civilization may become bankrupt and be replaced eventually by that of the Chinese or other eastern races, who in their turn, possibly earlier than now appears likely, may resort to “ birth-

\* Elements of Vital Statistics, by A. Newsholme, page 111.



control," as an alternative to war, pestilence, and famine, if these checks to population are inhibited. The facts and trends of events indicated above show the fundamental importance of strengthening the relationship between the organized community and the family in regard to child-bearing and child-rearing. Money is required to be spent on nurseries and schools rather than on armies."

The *social distribution of the falling birth-rate* is unsatisfactory. Without accepting the view of some eugenisists that socially desirable qualities, bodily and mental, are possessed in a higher ratio by the members of the upper and middle class social circles who now practise "birth-control" to a greater extent than do the mass of the population, it is clear that an unrestricted birth-rate prevails chiefly among those parents who are least able to give to their offspring the best in nutrition, in housing, in continuous care, and in physical and mental training, with the inevitable result that present conditions imply some lowering of our average mental and physical status. This need cause no excessive concern, for conception-control is extending, and there can be little doubt, in view of the extent to which it favours a more luxurious parental life, that ere long in this country, as already in France, it will be practised by the poorer classes, among whom the strain of a complete family is greatest. The only exception which appears likely will be that of Roman Catholic populations, if the Roman Church maintains its hold, and in that case the Italians and Irish will continue to have a high birth-rate while

the Anglo-Saxon populations may even cease to be a predominant element in Great Britain and in the United States.

There is the further possibility that a lowered birth-rate may become an article of faith in industrial circles, with a view to raising wages. This would be in accord with the older-fashioned economic teaching that restriction of the numbers of workers is the one efficient means of raising wages. Mrs. Sidney Webb\* has quoted an actual instance of a collective agreement of this kind among the union coal miners of Montceau in France, who after two unsuccessful strikes agreed to restrict the number of their families, with the result that the birth-rate of the whole commune within three years had fallen from 37 to 21 per 1000, and to-day stands at 14 per 1000. If such an industrial strike against parentage were to become general, the present social discrepancy in the size of families would disappear, and the unproved fears of debasement of the average *inheritance* of desirable mental and physical characters would cease, but at the expense of converting the human garden into a desert. As already suggested, such methods, towards which the example of the "intelligensia" appears to be heading us, ignore the inexorable fact that no nation lives to itself, and that Eastern and African races in such an event are likely to fill up the gaps left by our short-sighted action.

\* Article on "Personal Rights and the Women's Movement."  
*New Statesman*, 11th July, 1914.

Until the empty but desirable places of the earth are populated, until the absorptive capacity of other lands suitable for Englishmen—and with which England may have social and racial as well as commercial ties—is exhausted, a change in distribution of population is the remedy, and not the general practice of limited families, to which current indiscriminating propagandism is hustling us.

THE PERSONAL VIEW-POINT.—But although this is the desideratum from the wider point of view, it is in direct conflict with individual and family desires which are leading increasingly to limitation of families. This limitation far from being always the result of selfish desire for enjoyment and for avoidance of the healthy burdens of life, is oft-times dictated by motives worthy of respect.

Thus (1) the *health and strength of the wife* may be unequal to repeated maternity, though this plea is often erroneously adduced. When, however, there is for instance organic disease, e.g. heart disease or tuberculosis, or where parturition is followed by temporary insanity, there can be no hesitation in recommending the prevention of conception. Whether in such cases it should be by the exercise of continence, which would be urged by all responsible persons when one partner was confined in a lunatic asylum, or whether active conception-control should be practised, is a point for later consideration. Few physicians would hesitate to advise the practice of contraceptive methods in such cases, if the risk of pregnancy could not otherwise be avoided.

(2). The *housing difficulty* often renders the rearing of a family difficult or even impossible. Remedial measures for this are difficult of application ; meanwhile there is acute shortage of the structural requirements of family life, and for many the choice lies between single life and married life with no family or with a severely restricted one. Here again the difficult choices indicated in the preceding paragraph arise.

(3). *Poverty*, actual or relative, raises the same problems, and although the rule is sound that matrimony should only be entered into when the husband has a reasonable prospect of being able singly to maintain his wife and prospective family, many hard cases arise—including cases of unforeseen poverty—in which also the choice of action indicated above is called for.

The above paragraphs by no means exhaust the possible reasons rendering the rearing of normally complete families difficult, or even undesirable. There arises therefore, in exceptional instances, the need for the control of conception in married life, and consideration of the means to this end is most important. Such consideration to have weight must be based on a careful appreciation of the position of matrimony in a civilized and Christian country.

**MARRIAGE IN RELATION TO SELF-CONTROL.**—Marriage is too commonly regarded as a method of escape from sexual self-control, whereas its highest success means a permanent union, in which body mind and spirit play their co-ordinated part ; and this success is dependent on self-control

activated by mutual regard and consideration. Married life, at its best, is a school of unselfishness, a "mutually beneficial symbiosis," the successful functioning of which depends on mutual devotion and worship, on chivalry, and on co-ordinated self-control. It is only thus that sexuality can become sublimated, and that a complete and perfect union is achieved.

In relation to such a union dogmatic judgments of conduct are impracticable, and become especially so when there is artificial interference with normal marital relations. The justification of such interference is a matter for individual judgment. No one can claim the position of a spiritual director in a relationship in which so many and so delicate factors are concerned. Moral dogmatism in this connection appears to be unjustified ; what is needed is faithfulness to the principles of love and temperance, guided by knowledge of the elements of hygiene in their bearing on normal sex life.

If every husband and wife at the time of marriage received satisfactory instruction in the physiology of their joint life, the supposed necessity for contraceptive measures would be greatly reduced. Lady Barrett has stressed this point in stating that "if . . . moderation is really practised, it is possible to lead a natural married life such as renders the use of artificial contraceptives with all their attendant evils unnecessary, and yet limit the size of the family." \* 'This presumably would

\* "Conception Control and its Effects on the Individual and the Nation." By Lady Barrett, C.B.E., 1922.

necessitate instruction in the fact that conception does not occur between the 22nd and 28th day from the beginning of the last menstrual period. It should be noted that this physiological fact is not universally accepted, but it is agreed that conception at this period of normal cyclical life is at least uncommon.

The teaching of such facts as the above implies the desirability of some "spacing out" of successive children, and the employment of means—not artificial, but only the exercise of self-restraint—to this end.

The burden which more frequent child-bearing involves, especially when domestic assistance is lacking, and the mother's strength is over-taxed, justifies efforts in this direction; and even when artificial contraceptives are used, a just judgment of the expediency and wisdom of such action is a matter for the married persons concerned, and cannot be given by outsiders.

**THE ETHICS OF CONTRACEPTION.**—The practice of contraception has become very common, and to assert that it is always or generally unjustified is to assume a dogmatic attitude which is contrary to the spirit of Christianity. But in view of the urgent desirability that those, able financially, and competent physically and mentally to rear normal families, should do so, an altered outlook on this problem is needed.

(1). In some instances the fear of the pain of parturition is a serious incentive to contraceptive measures. It should be more widely known that

medical science can now do much to minimise this suffering, and that childless marriages are commonly associated with ill-health of the wife.

(2). When motives of social expediency or the desire for luxury—exemplified in the preference of an automobile to an infant—lead to a restricted family, one can appeal to two motives, namely the desire to serve the community and the influence of a changed public opinion. The desire for social welfare is one aspect of the religious motive and this is inoperative for a large section of the population. Apart from specific religious belief, can conscience be brought to a degree of sensitiveness which, as suggested in Mrs. Webb's article already quoted, will produce "a new mysticism which compels our intelligence or our heart to give up the fulfilment of desire without the performance of service"? If this is to come, it will be associated with a widening of the conception of the family which will end in realisation of the fact that the community is the social family. In this respect the present position is troubled and confused, and the functions of parents and of the State are not so closely inter-related as is desirable. Closer association between the two would obviate many of the difficulties which it is now proposed to solve by the "short cut" of contraceptives.

**FAMILY AND STATE.**—How can this association be accomplished without serious loss of individual and family responsibility? It is well to recognise how far we have already travelled, as we can then see more clearly the lack of foundation or the ex-

aggragation of language in the statements as to undermining personal responsibility by communal provisions. The State since Elizabethan times has accepted the full responsibility of saving any member of the community from death by starvation. This is the basic line of the English Poor Law administration ; and as time has passed this provision has evolved to an extent which entitles any impoverished person who lacks it, and who is personally helpless, to the provision by the community of his specific necessity for health and life, whether this necessity be medical attendance or food or raiment or housing. Public health activities have widened communal responsibility; and the prevention and treatment of fevers, of tuberculosis, of venereal disease, and in large measure the medical and hygienic care of infancy and childhood, to some extent also the detection and treatment of defects and disease in school-children, have become organised on a co-operative basis at the expense of the community as a whole. The National Insurance Act, in virtue of its state contributions and of the compulsory contributions by employers, implies that in large measure the State is responsible for the partial maintenance in sickness and the medical treatment of one-third of the total population of Great Britain. These and other measures have vastly extended the inter-oscultations of individual and State effort for the promotion of individual welfare. The compulsory education of children, the prevention of their industrial employment, and lastly the rapidly extending scope of state-subsidised insur-



ance against unemployment, further illustrate the extent to which the State has found it necessary to act co-operatively in the maintenance of personal and family welfare.

But if the State is to continue and to extend the co-operative efforts illustrated above, especially if it is to maintain those who cannot obtain employment, is it not concerned in preventing over-population? On this subject three points need to be noted. 1st. The State is not a separate entity, but the collective will of the whole or of a majority of a given community. 2nd. The prevention of over-population, if this be regarded as the cure for social evils, is in active progress owing to the increasing limitation of families. 3rd. The British Empire is suffering from imperfect and uneconomical distribution of population rather than from over-population, and from the artificial production of poverty and resultant inability to trade on an adequate scale produced by the Great War. In this connection the International Control of Peace and prevention of war, including the international control of the competition of labour of various grades of civilisation becomes an important alternative to indiscriminating efforts to produce a human desert.

From the national standpoint, the State could redistribute the burdens and rewards of life in a manner which would favour family life more than at present. There is general acceptance of the principle of equal payment for equal work in industrial and other forms of work, regardless of the number of dependents of the worker. So far as I

know, the chief exceptions to this rule are in the sex-differences of salary for equal service in some branches of the Civil Service and in the teaching profession. The above principle involves inequitable distribution of the burdens of communal life. Childless married people and single persons as a rule require smaller houses and less food than the parents of normal families, with the result that the aggregate amount of rates and of taxes levied on parents is greater than that levied on childless persons. The contribution of the State in assisting to rear and educate children compensates only to a very limited extent for this bias against the parent. This elementary consideration justifies and indeed calls for extended effort to overcome the handicap now borne by parents, and for a cessation by the State of partial penalisation of child-bearing. The detailed measures to this end will require careful consideration; but they will include more effective rebates of income tax, and the making of education—higher as well as elementary—more completely a communal charge. Into the question of the endowment of motherhood one cannot enter here, but action in this direction is called for, as well as a systematisation on a vastly extended scale of training of boys and girls for their life-work and of arrangements for local readjustment of population as they are needed.

**POSSIBLE CHANGE IN PUBLIC OPINION.**—In securing reform which will remove the handicap on families and which may also render the general

practice of contraception unpopular, we need to be reminded of the great possibilities of evoking a higher level of ideals. Historically, the changes in national and international ethics in the last century have been so great as to make one hopeful that in relation to marriage and family life, we may secure ere long a higher standard of sexual morality and a more general appreciation of the personal and communal value of complete family life. The abolition of slavery and of capital punishment for crimes other than murder, the many interferences with industry and with domestic life calculated to safeguard life and health, the enforcement of legislation against cruelty to children and to animals, the remarkable advancement in the relative position of women, and the diminution of alcoholism, are examples of the good which can be effected by a steadily increasing sensitiveness of the aggregate human conscience. There is reason to believe therefore that the present maleficent wave of indiscriminating propagandism against child-bearing will itself be submerged in a purer national outlook, which will produce an adequate contribution to the total population from each constituent section of it.

Education in this direction will proceed on at least four lines. 1st. The existing sub-conscious public opinion which actively favours childless or unduly limited families will need to be changed. This implies housing reforms of great magnitude, and removal of the disabilities which a large family implies in some occupations. 2nd. There is needed a further strengthening and elaboration of the reciprocal relations between organised society and

the individual, on lines some of which are enumerated on page 163.

3rd. It is even more necessary that ethical and organised Christian opinion should strenuously expose and attempt to remove the social and economic conditions which make the rearing of families difficult, as for instances inadequate wages. Much in this direction can be done by the example of those who are prepared to show how life may be simplified without curtailment of happiness. Family life, in which husband and wife and five or six children grow up in orderly succession with the daily practice of mutual helpfulness and the joy of serving others, still furnishes the family training which produces the noblest of mankind. On the other hand, the one child commonly is pampered and selfish, and seldom becomes a manly man. Experience, especially during the Great War, has illustrated the terrible family blanks occurring in such truncated families. It is true that the large family if accepted carries with it the correlative duties of frugality and of restraint of "pleasures," but it offers rewards which are a manifold recompense.

4th. It is important that the training in self-control should form a more definite object of every child's education than it is at present. Teaching in the hygiene of sex is required, but immensely more important is the training in the formation of habits of self-control which the wise mother is able to give in infancy and in childhood. This when strengthened by careful guidance in adolescence and early adult life, is competent to counteract in

large measure the dangers arising from the "over-sexing" of which mankind is commonly the subject.

But when every child has received a satisfactory early training in self-control in all relations of life, when wise guidance in adolescence is given, when earlier marriages have reduced the likelihood of promiscuity and resultant venereal disease, and when state and communal action as suggested on page 86 has been taken, small families will probably still continue, though it may be hoped not to an increasing extent, and the instances enumerated on page 80 give some of the more important circumstances which will lead to their continuance and to the use of contraceptives to secure them.

ARGUMENTS FOR CONTRACEPTIVES.—It may reasonably be urged that limitation of marital relations to the period indicated on p. 159 implies too great a strain on some persons, and that furthermore it may prove ineffective in preventing pregnancy. If this amount of abstinence or an even greater amount is unsuccessful, when child-bearing admittedly is undesirable, then fear is expressed as to the risk of the repressed complexes or neuroses which it is suggested may be caused by deprivation of an established function. The last word has not been said on this point, but it may be taken that in recent developments of psychology this point has been gravely exaggerated, doubtful hypotheses sometimes being accepted as fact.

The ideal of the ethical life is that of a man who is master of himself, the Christian holding that he

obtains this mastery by Divine help, and that the goodness thus secured is the great object in life.\* It is thus that a man attains the perfect freedom given by self-control. The question for each married couple who after careful consideration have decided on restriction of their family is whether they will secure freedom from strain by the use of contraceptives or they will practise the continence which self-control renders practicable. In the words of the article quoted below "the man or woman who values self-control for itself as an intrinsic element in that freedom of spirit which is the goal of life, will not hesitate in the choice." The difference between the two lines of conduct—summarised in the words continence or contraceptives—has been compared with the theological distinction between the minimum necessary to salvation and the ideal Christian character. Self-control and the freedom thereby secured is worth seeking for its own sake; but while this is the higher standard, "when men and women honestly believe themselves to be justified in the sight of God in using physical methods of birth-control, their consciences must be respected."

This being the ethical view of the case, and more especially the Christian view, it remains to state briefly some of the more important points as to the use of contraceptives.

1. It has been urged that their application is likely to increase sexual incontinence in married

\* See an admirable article on "Birth-control and Christian Ethics." By Rev. Leonard Hodgson, M.A. (Hibbert Journal, Oct. 1923).

life, while greatly increasing the risk of fornication. The value of virtue which depends on absence of awkward consequences is relatively small, though it is preferable to vice. No great importance need be attached to this point.

2. It is urged as axiomatic that "any deviation from the natural consummation of the act as dictated and intended by nature must be detrimental in some degree to both parties contracting" (Sir W. Abbot-Anderson in *Practitioner*, July 1923).

This raises the general question of possible injury by contraceptives which it is not proposed to discuss fully in this chapter. In view of their wide use, the amount of evidence of mischief from their use is scanty and indefinite, though evidently it is a matter in which evidence is difficult to collect, and furthermore the problem is one in which it is necessarily difficult to establish a causal relation between this practice and the physical or psychical disorders which are common in married women using contraceptives. An exception must be made in regard to what is the most widely advertised form of contraceptives, (metallic stem pessaries) which is stated to have produced serious physical mischief in many cases and even death.

*Legislative control?* In the United States a legislative action has been taken to limit the giving of advice, or the sale of appliances or drugs for the prevention of conception, or their transmission by mail. Federal legislation has been directed to limiting the manufacture and sale of all contraceptive articles and drugs to the State in which they are

produced. Detailed legislation of a drastic character has been passed by individual States, In Connecticut the use of "any drug, medicinal article, or instrument for preventing conception" is prohibited, an enactment so rigid, as to make absolute continence the only alternative to child-bearing, if the law were enforced. In New York State there is similar legislation, physicians lawfully practising for the prevention or cure of disease being excepted therefrom. In Massachusetts and other States not only is the giving or sale of contraceptives illegal, but also the giving of information concerning them or the transmission of them through the post.

Such legislation cannot be effective, and in so far as it interferes with the liberty of the physician to give advice to his individual patient or of the patient to ask for such advice it is mischievous. But apart from legislation which is so sweeping as to be ineffective, we may reasonably ask whether it is not against public policy to give information as to the use of contraceptives to the general public, whether the advertising of books and pamphlets on this subject should be allowed, and whether the use of postal facilities for spreading information on this subject should not be prevented? An affirmative answer should, in my view, be given to these questions, though it must be recognised that prohibitive action in these directions can only be effective when it has behind it the force of preponderant public opinion.

In summarising the main conclusions derivable from this scanty study of the subject of conception



control, the following statements may be made.

1. A steady reduction in natural increase of population by births is occurring in most western nations, which if continued will mean for these nations a stationary population like that of France.

2. This reduction is due to the active control of conception, in the main by artificial means, and not in any considerable extent to reduction of marriages, to advance in the age of marriage, or to changes in human fertility.

3. So long as large parts of the British Empire and of the United States are sparsely populated, and so long as emigration and trans-migration of population are so inadequately carried out, stoppage of the supply of new life is undesirable nationally and imperially.

4. The present distribution of conception-control implies that the parents who are most competent to give adequate nurture and culture to their children are contributing relatively little to the new life in the population.

5. There is in modern conditions of life a direct conflict between the national and the personal view-points. The strain of rapid child-bearing, difficulties of housing, poverty and allied conditions, as well as special diseases, often render child-bearing undesirable, and the practical problem is as to the legitimacy of means to this end.

6. The marriage relationship ought to imply a large element of self-restraint, and this in itself might suffice to limit the family.

7. Where this is not so, alternatives to limitation of the family should be organized. These will

include an extension of the nexus between the family and the organised community, the burdens and rewards of life being redistributed so as not to handicap family life.

8. Public opinion can be educated to assist in the removal of the social and economic conditions which make the rearing of families difficult ; and the training of young children in habits of self-control—on which right living in adult life so largely depends—should be more scientifically and systematically undertaken.

9. Conception-control is a special practice for certain individuals for reasons special to themselves. It is undesirable as a policy for a nation.

10. When, after careful consideration and if possible medical consultation, parents wish to prevent further pregnancies, two lines of procedure are open, the practice of continence, and the use of artificial means for preventing conception. The first of these is in accord with the highest standard of conduct ; but each married couple must decide for themselves on this point, and the time has not come for dogmatic approval or disapproval of either course of action.

11. Certain methods of contraception are fraught with risk to those practising them, and there is reason to think that any interference with a normal function may favour illness or even actual disease.

12. It is in the writer's view contrary to public policy to permit the advertisement or public exposure for sale or transmission through the post of methods or appliances for conception control.

The question is one for individual medical and hygienic advice: and as an alternative to such prohibited publicity, medical advice should be made available to all married persons who consider that restriction of births is desirable.

## DIVORCE

BY THE REV. ERIC GRAHAM, M.A.

### §1 THE MEANING OF THE WORD

DISCUSSION of a subject is always rendered easier and more profitable by a clear recognition of what exactly the subject is. In the present case this clear recognition is of special importance for two reasons. First, the subject is one which arouses very strong feeling on both sides; and secondly, the word "divorce" is apt to be used in no less than three different senses. Thus if two men are arguing the question of increased facilities for divorce, it is quite possible for one of them to maintain that the Church has never allowed divorce, (and therefore never can), and for his opponent to maintain that the Church has always allowed divorce, (and therefore may legitimately extend the grounds for it). Here we have an apparent contradiction in a matter of historical fact; and yet both disputants are telling the truth. The Church has allowed divorce in two senses of that word; but in a third sense she has never permitted it at all. Let us look at these three different senses in turn.

(1). It has happened from time to time that after two parties have gone through the marriage ceremony—it may be years afterwards—some fatal

impediment to the original marriage is discovered,\* which means that the contract between them has been in reality null and void from the first. In such cases the supposed marriage may be terminated by a decree of nullity. In our own time and country these cases are rare; the decrees, when required, are pronounced by the High Court of Justice. But so long as matrimonial causes were under the jurisdiction of Ecclesiastical Courts, no other possibility of divorce “a vinculo”—from the marriage bond—was recognised.† *A marriage once validly contracted and consummated was held to constitute a natural relationship which nothing except death could terminate.* And this is still the view of the Western Church, including the Church of England.

(2). The second kind of “divorce” is that which is called divorce “a mensa et thoro,” from bed and board. This, again, has been and still is recognised by the Church, as a necessary measure of relief when the conduct of one partner of the marriage has made cohabitation intolerable. But such divorce, in conformity with the principle stated above, did not carry with it the right of re-marriage. Thus, by the 107th Canon of 1603, the Church of England requires that “the parties so separated shall live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other’s life, contract

\* e.g. Close kinship between the two parties, or physical incapacity in either of them.

† The three “divorces” of Henry VIII were technically decrees of nullity.

matrimony with any other person." One great advantage of this limitation was that it left the door to repentance and reconciliation perpetually open ; and the two parties could resume cohabitation without any formal process. This advantage is preserved by a decree of Judicial Separation,\* which is the modern equivalent of the ecclesiastical divorce, "a mensa et thoro."

(8). But it is the third sense of "divorce" which the word generally bears to-day. This is *the dissolution of an admittedly valid marriage* ; a dissolution which legally entitles either partner, whether innocent or guilty, to contract a fresh marriage at will.

Divorce of this kind the Church can never recognise ; it is a direct contradiction of her fundamental principle that marriage is by nature and by our Lord's teaching indissoluble, whatever law the State may pass, and whatever sentence a judge may pronounce.

In what follows the word "divorce," unless otherwise qualified, will be used in this third sense.

## § 2 THE PRESENT SITUATION.

Until the year 1857 Parliament allowed the Church to retain jurisdiction in matrimonial causes, and that on the old basis of the indissolubility of marriage. Then came a revolution. The juris-

\* By an act of 1895 Separation orders ceased to be in the sole jurisdiction of the High Court : poor women may apply for them before a Stipendiary Magistrate, or a local Bench of Magistrates, in cases of assault, desertion, persistent cruelty, refusal of maintenance, or habitual drunkenness, on the part of the husband.

diction of the ecclesiastical tribunals was transferred to secular courts; and at the same time it was enacted that a husband could secure divorce from an unfaithful wife, and a wife from an unfaithful husband if his infidelity was aggravated in certain ways, e.g. by cruelty or by desertion for two years. Quite recent legislation has "equalised" matters as between men and women by making the husband's infidelity in itself a sufficient ground for divorce.

Since 1857, therefore, the marriage laws of Church and State have diverged. The common assumption that the Church of England has acquiesced in the State's action, we must repudiate as strongly as possible. There is indeed a section of opinion in the Church of England which is disposed to concede the right of re-marriage to the *innocent* party in a divorce suit; and the official attitude of Eastern Orthodoxy and the American Church can be quoted in support of it, as well as a resolution of the Lambeth Conference—which fortunately is quite informal. Even this position, however, does not agree with the law of the State in allowing re-marriage to the guilty partner. It also professes to be based on our Lord's own teaching, and so claims our respectful attention.

Our critical reasons for refusing to accept it as the authentic teaching of our Lord are referred to in an Appendix (pp. 240 ff); but there are other considerations which tell strongly against it. First, it is wholly illogical to say that the innocent party in a divorce suit may marry again, but not the guilty party. The original marriage bond is *either*

intact *or* dissolved. If it is intact, then neither party can marry again. If it is dissolved, then both parties must have the same liberty of re-marriage ; as the State law recognises.

Secondly, there is cogency in Lord Buckmaster's question.\* "What is there in adultery to cause it alone to act as a solvent of the marriage tie?" We must indeed emphasise the special wickedness and baseness of adultery, as against the lax morals of the present generation ; but it remains true that deliberate desertion, for instance, is more fatal to married life than one act of infidelity, committed perhaps in a passing moment of passion. Therefore if divorce is to be allowed at all, it becomes extremely difficult in justice or in logic to restrict it to this single ground.† This reinforces our belief that the only standpoint which is fundamentally sound and in accordance with our Lord's will, is the standpoint of "no divorce."

Thirdly, when once the innocent partner is re-married, all opportunity for reconciliation and amendment is taken away from the guilty partner. Such a discouragement of repentance is not in accordance with the highest moral standards, and therefore it cannot be justified on Christian grounds.

\* In the *Spectator* for December 8th, 1923.

† The idea held in some quarters that an act of adultery of itself *dissolves* the marriage tie has impossible consequences. It would mean, *e.g.*, that a faithful and unsuspecting spouse by continuing to cohabit with the guilty partner, would thereby be living in fornication—however unconscious and involuntary.



We are compelled therefore to set aside the mediating position which maintains that divorce is allowable, but only on the ground of adultery, and to realise that our choice is restricted to two alternatives: 'no divorce,' and 'divorce for a variety of causes.' The State, unfortunately, has already taken one step in the latter direction by the Act of 1857; our task now is to estimate the results of that legislation.

1. It is astonishing to remember that the promoters of the 1857 Act, "reckoned upon quite a small number of divorce cases occurring every year. They expected a single Judge to do all the matrimonial work and the testamentary work as well, and they thought it possible that upon the next vacancy occurring in the Admiralty Court he might also add that work, besides being a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and available on occasions to sit in that body." \* In our own days extra Judges have been brought to the work, and procedure has been accelerated, yet we hear on all sides complaints of delay, and the waiting list is always long.

Thus the first and plainest result of the 1857 Act is the irretrievable break-up of thousands of homes. What was originally introduced as a measure of relief for a comparatively few hard cases has increased the very evil it was intended to remedy. Married folk who under a rule of "no divorce" would have composed their domestic

\* Lord Phillimore on 'The Law of Divorce,' Church Quarterly Review, April 1923. I have made further use of this excellent article in § 3.

differences, are now encouraged to let things go from bad to worse in the hope of ultimate release from the marriage bond by means of the divorce court. Hence this one breach in the old law of indissoluble marriage has reacted disastrously on the security of home life ; and experience seems always to show that when once divorce is made possible on any pretext whatsoever, the percentage of divorces will increase year by year continuously. \*

Possibly it may be urged that this increase in the number of divorces merely means that there were more hard cases amongst us than had been realised. This is a very unsound inference, as will briefly be shown by two further results of the 1857 legislation.

2. In many cases where a divorce is given on the ground of adultery, there would have been no adultery at all under the old law. But the law as it now stands has actually encouraged what may be called *ad hoc* adultery, by making that sin the one avenue of escape from the marriage-tie. Comment is superfluous.

\* Moreover the legalising of divorce has reduced almost to nothing the number of Judicial Separations in cases where circumstances allow the more drastic decree. It has become unfashionable and in practice extremely difficult for an innocent partner to petition for anything less than the 'complete remedy' in such cases ; it is a vagary viewed with suspicion except in the case of Roman Catholics or a few eccentric Anglicans who are known to have 'antiquated' views on the indissolubility of marriage. Thus divorce has become the uniform practice ; and the home is broken up finally with no hope of reconciliation.

3. In many cases where a divorce is desired but *ad hoc* adultery not contemplated, the husband puts in his wife's hands evidence that he has stayed with some other woman at a public establishment, and deliberately gives the false impression that he has committed adultery. This "collusion" is extremely fashionable, and sometimes has even been publicly acknowledged after the decree *nisi* has been made absolute.\* But it is an outrage on the Court, and on public decency.

We have now observed three results of the 1857 Act—all of them unforeseen by its authors—which it is impossible to contemplate with equanimity. Our main object in calling attention to them is to indicate that the State's departure from the Christian marriage code has been no mere breach of an ecclesiastical regulation, but a social and moral disaster to the community. It is true that as Churchmen we are pledged to the law of indissoluble marriage as a matter of religious obedience, without reference to practical consequences. But we are entitled to point out practical consequences when we seek to commend the law of indissoluble marriage to our fellow-countrymen who do not share our Catholic allegiance. We believe that here, as in every department of life, the religion of the Incarnation is

\* In one notorious case some years ago, the husband who was a well-known and active M.P., actually blamed the Church for the state of things which made such conduct on his part necessary! So little is the position of the Church understood even by our legislators.

the best guide to true health and soundness, both for the individual and for the State.

Unfortunately there is a contrary policy in the field to-day, with strong and influential, if not popular, backing. It is the policy of those who regard divorce as a convenient cure for domestic ills, which should be made freely accessible to all. Let us see what the policy professes, and what it is likely to perform.

### §3 THE AIMS OF DIVORCE LAW "REFORMERS."

The main aims of the Divorce Law "Reformers" are most conveniently summarised in the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Divorce (1909-1912). In addition to the grounds for divorce now allowed by law, they propose the following :

1. Desertion for three years (or more).
2. Cruelty.
3. Incurable insanity after five years' confinement.
4. Habitual drunkenness found incurable after three years from the first separation order.
5. Imprisonment for life under commuted death sentence.

When Lord Buckmaster in 1920 introduced a Bill to give legislative effect to the Majority Report, the House of Lords passed the first four clauses enumerated above by varying but decisive majorities. The fifth clause was dropped, but the proposal figures in Lord Buckmaster's *Spectator*

article of December 8th, 1923, and so must still be taken into account. At the same time there was passed by a very small majority (52 to 45) the monstrous provision that an applicant for a decree of separation, if the other party requested a divorce, should be *compelled to choose between having a divorce and no relief at all*. On this subject we shall have more to say in a moment. The third reading of the whole bill was carried by 154 votes to 107. But it is encouraging to observe that in the House of Commons, in the same year, a proposal to give legislative effect to the Majority Report was negatived by 134 votes to 91, in favour of Mr. Ronald McNeill's amendment, which ran thus:—

“That in the opinion of this House, while it is desirable to place the sexes on a footing of equality as regards divorce, any change in the law which would impair the permanence of the marriage contract would be harmful to the best interests of the community.”

Let us now look more closely at the Majority Report proposals, and see whether they bear out Lord Buckmaster's hopeful view of them, or Mr. Ronald McNeill's. We may begin by taking the points which Lord Buckmaster raises in the *Spectator* article already mentioned.

We notice first that his challenge is thrown down to “the defenders of our existing law,” and only to them; and we have admitted already that the case against such proposals as his is gravely weakened by allowing any exception to the law of indissoluble marriage. But even those churchmen who would

permit re-marriage to the innocent partner in a divorce suit, are not, as we have seen, true "defenders of our existing law," which allows re-marriage to the guilty party also. Still less can those who follow Catholic tradition in upholding the *absolute* indissolubility of marriage be classed as champions of the 1857 legislation. We only defend that legislation in the sense that we do not want an already bad law to be changed for the worse; we should like the existing facilities removed, but if that may not be, our next concern is to guard against their increase. Yet Lord Buckmaster speaks as though opposition to any extension of facilities for divorce implied a whole-hearted approval of the existing law.

Secondly, he regards "defenders of our existing law" as depending on the fragile support of tradition, and of "skilled interpreters of ambiguous texts." This is a strange mistake for so eminent a lawyer to make; he seems not to be aware that "our existing law," so far from being based on the old tradition, has made a serious breach in it; and that even the (to him) most favourable interpretation of the "ambiguous texts" in S. Matthew could only justify far less than the 1857 law allows.

In turning to Lord Buckmaster's more positive statements, we must note once again that he is only professing to show that desertion and the other proposed grounds for divorce, are "at least as strong as the one case (already) allowed"—i.e. adultery; so that even if we considered him to have proved his point, his conclusions would have

no bearing at all on the Catholic position. If these other causes are as "strong" as adultery, then adultery as a ground for divorce is as weak as these other causes, and should be abolished accordingly.

We have already noticed certain moral and social consequences of the 1857 Act, and have contended that they supply cogent evidence for the superiority of the Church's law to that of the State. We may now see whether the legalising of these other suggested grounds for divorce is likely to have happier results.

#### I. DESERTION FOR THREE YEARS (OR MORE).

Desertion, says Lord Buckmaster, "implies the complete and absolute renunciation of every duty undertaken by marriage." With this judgment we agree; and we are no whit behind him in condemning conduct so heartless, or in realising the deplorable condition of the wife—it is almost always the wife\*—so deserted. It is no part of our case to minimise the hardships of innocent sufferers from desertion or cruelty, or from such afflictions as the lunacy or perpetual imprisonment of husband or wife. On the general problem raised by all those cases we shall have something to say later on. But first let us see the kind of "relief" which would be given in cases of desertion if legislation on the lines desired by Lord Buckmaster and his

\* Desertion of the husband by the wife practically never takes place, except when she elopes with a paramour and so is guilty of open adultery and not simply "desertion."

friends had taken place. This, as we have seen, is almost entirely a woman's question.

Let us suppose, then, that a husband and wife have been married some years, and that the husband, who is of a fickle disposition, has grown tired of the wife. Then he finds elsewhere a young woman more to his liking and deserts his wife; but without giving her any legally valid evidence of technical "infidelity." What is she to do? There are three courses open to her. She may take no action at all; but this will probably leave her in an impossible position financially, and with no protection against the man's interference with her and her children, if any. Secondly, she may apply for a separation. Thirdly, she may get a divorce. Now it is quite reasonable and just that she should take the second course. She is entitled to think that such a man as her husband can only bring unhappiness to a second "wife," and should not be given the opportunity. She may even be a Christian, and convinced that divorce in such a case is divinely forbidden. So she applies for a Judicial Separation. And the husband counters her application by offering her *either* a divorce *or* nothing, in accordance with Lord Buckmaster's own proposal passed by the House of Lords, which we have already characterised as monstrous. In this miserable dilemma she chooses divorce, though probably without any intention of re-marriage and perhaps with the definite conviction that re-marriage is not permissible. But the husband cheerfully "weds" his new bride.

Now we do not suppose for one moment that



this is the kind of thing which Lord Buckmaster and his friends mean to encourage, any more than the legislators of 1857 meant to encourage *ad hoc* adultery or collusion. But it is certain that the practical results will be as we have sketched them, or worse. Worse, because while the desertion which we have spoken of is genuine desertion, most of the "desertions" which would be pleaded under the revised law would not be genuine. If husband and wife are tired of each other, they agree to remain apart, and after three years (though the period would in all probability be shortened by fresh legislation) evidence of "desertion" will have accrued. In other words what is called divorce for desertion will simply amount to divorce by mutual consent. Collusion of this kind is scandalously prevalent in America.

That the "three years" of the present proposal would before long become two or even one is certain, if the clause is ever to touch the really hard cases. For in these cases—i.e., when the desertion is genuine—the worst of the hardship and the difficulty is felt at first; and the uncertain prospect of re-marriage three years later is, as the Minority Report points out, "very cold comfort." \* But whether the period is shortened or not, it is certain that this fresh way of escape from the marriage tie, if and when enacted by law, will be used, more or less fraudulently, in hundreds of cases never contemplated by its proposers.

\* See Divorce Commission Report, pp. 180 f.

II & IV. CRUELTY AND HABITUAL DRUNKENNESS.

A happy married life is clearly impossible where either of these deplorable conditions exists. The main question is whether the relief given by separation is inadequate, and divorce should be substituted. With this large principle we deal below ;\* but it may be noted in passing that divorce allows not only the innocent party to re-marry, but the guilty also. Separation forbids re-marriage in either case ; but it both liberates the sufferer from the intolerable misery of cohabitation with a cruel or besotted spouse, and restrains the latter from making havoc of a second home under the aegis of the law.

We may point out also that "cruelty" is a very difficult thing to define ; much depends both on the cultural level and the personal characteristics of the parties concerned. Words may be far more cruel to a sensitive nature than blows ; and liberation from mental anguish is no less desirable than from physical violence. But there is no definite stopping point on this road short of "incompatibility of temper," which does not figure as a ground for divorce in the programme of the Majority Report. Meanwhile in America "cruelty" as the nominal ground for a divorce which is really collusive, is almost, if not quite, as popular as "desertion" ; and the definition of cruelty †

\* § 5

† "Cruelty is such conduct by one married person to the other party to the marriage as makes it unsafe, having regard

suggested by the Majority Report leaves the way open for such an abuse on a very large scale.

### III. INCURABLE INSANITY AFTER FIVE YEARS' CONFINEMENT.

Many who would reject the other grounds for divorce proposed by the Majority Report, are inclined to accept this one as having special cogency. Incurable insanity is regarded as moral and intellectual death, the death of everything which constitutes real manhood and womanhood: real personality. Now there is a measure of truth in this; and we fully agree with Lord Buckmaster that lunacy "is one of the most awful scourges that afflict humanity." But the case for making it a ground for divorce cannot be established.

First, no question arises here of delivering husband or wife from an intolerable domestic position. The insane partner is removed, and out of the other's way; there is no daily degradation or peril of violence crying out for a drastic remedy. The pathos of the whole situation for the sane partner lies in the strange and sad eclipse of the other's intellect; it is not, we may hope, a purely selfish grief, for his or her own shattered prospects in life.

Secondly, it is not safe, especially in these days

---

to the risk of life, limb, or health, bodily or mental, for the latter to continue to live with the former."—Report, p. 71.

It is obviously easy to plead that "mental health" is impaired by incompatibility of temper, and cohabitation therefore rendered "unsafe."

of rapid scientific advance, to assume that any case of insanity is beyond hope of cure.

Thirdly, the medical evidence given before the Commission made it clear that to constitute incurable insanity a ground for divorce would be likely to produce "a distressing and highly prejudicial effect both on persons suffering from temporary attacks of mania, and on those who, without being insane, may have an apprehension, well or ill founded, that there is a risk of their becoming so." The great majority of experts on mental disease were opposed to the proposal.\*

It should also be remembered that incurable insanity does not always mean total insanity. In many instances, persons rightly and necessarily confined as insane, are not oblivious of their home ties, but derive the greatest pleasure of which they are capable from the visits of husband or wife.

Fourthly insanity is a disease; and "to allow any disease, no matter what its nature and extent, to annul a mutual contract . . . seems . . . to be in some measure a reversion to the ruthlessness of savage life."†

Fifthly, it is obvious that relief in cases where one partner of the marriage is confined as insane, is far less urgent than in cases where the insanity is periodically recurrent, and therefore productive of much more anxiety and mental strain for the sane partner. But we notice once more that there is no

\* See further Sir George Savage's evidence; Report, p. 182.

† Sir James Crichton-Brown, M.D., F.R.S.: quoted by Mr. Kenneth Ingram in "Is Divorce Needed?" p. 63.

satisfactory stopping point: if an intermittent mental disease is to be a ground for divorce, then other distressing diseases must be placed in the same category; if it is not, then the (far less cogent) case for incurable insanity breaks down. We come back to the principle underlying Sir James Crichton-Brown's dictum: that divorce for disease in any shape or form is fundamentally vicious.\*

#### V. IMPRISONMENT FOR LIFE UNDER COMMUTED DEATH SENTENCE.†

Imprisonment "for life" means, normally, for about twenty years. Now if there is one thing calculated to keep hope alive in a convict's heart, and to excite him to do all that can be done by good conduct towards shortening the term of imprisonment, it is the thought of a faithful wife who waits, however wearily, to give him a loving welcome and a new start when he leaves the prison. The present proposal, with cynical hardheartedness, deprives the condemned man of this hope, and absolves the wife from her allegiance because, forsooth, she must endure hardness in maintaining it. Such a view of conjugal fidelity is shamed not merely by Christian standards, but

\* There is no objection to a decree of nullity, in cases where husband or wife is proved to have been of unsound mind *at the time of marriage*, and the other party ignorant of the fact.

† Mr. J. A. Spender, who signed the Majority Report, goes beyond his colleagues in desiring to make "all sentences of five years and upwards a ground for divorce." Report, p. 170.

even by respectable paganism: Penelope in the Odyssey, who waited twenty years for her absent husband, and rejected all suitors for her hand, would doubtless have been much more sensible if she had seized betimes one of the many available opportunities for a fresh marriage. But she waited: twenty years; and who can fail to realise that she was right? \*

We may conclude at this point our detailed comments on the Divorce Law "Reform" programme. In the next Section we try to indicate in a broader way some of the vital principles which its proposals ignore or violate.

## §4. VITAL PRINCIPLES.

### I. A DIVORCE LAW MUST BE BASED ON SOME PRINCIPLE, AND NOT ON MERE OPPORTUNISM.

When we turn from criticising the intentions and probable results of the proposals before us, to a more general survey of their *raison d'être*, the somewhat striking fact emerges that no principle at all underlies either the programme as a whole, or any single item which it includes. There is no

\* Attention may be drawn to Mrs. Hodder's evidence before the Divorce Commission, quoted in the Report, pp. 183.f During eleven years spent in visiting prisoners' wives and families "I have seen," she says, "some 3,000 cases; I have analysed my books and find that 1,575 were long-sentence cases, ranging from one to 20 years . . . During the whole of my experience in dealing with these people I have never heard of one desiring divorce; the great majority of the women are very faithful to their husbands."

principle which fixes the time limit for desertion at three years, rather than four or two ; or makes a twenty years imprisonment a ground for divorce but not any shorter term ; or defines cruelty with such laxity as to include, for practical purposes, mutual incompatibility, while yet refusing to adopt the wider proposal openly and plainly ; or takes into account one form of disease—incurable insanity—while ignoring other forms which are less spectacular but far more productive of suffering and anxiety to the other partner of the marriage.

Perhaps the framers of the Majority Report intend to indicate a definite principle, when they speak of conditions which “are generally and properly recognised as leading to the break-up of married life,” i.e. presumably, all conditions in which married life ceases to be the regular cohabitation of husband and wife, in tolerable amity and decency. If this is indeed the Majority’s guiding principle, then we are bound to point out that they have not attempted to carry it into effect. If once the indissolubility of marriage is set aside, the only real binding force left to a married pair is the mutual love of husband and wife. Nothing “breaks up married life” so fundamentally as the absence of love ; a marriage which is not marred by desertion or insanity or cruelty or drunkenness, or any other palpable failure of health or morals, and yet is without love, is a far more disastrous and desolating condition than a marriage in which love persists in spite of desertion or insanity or cruelty or drunkenness. Therefore on this principle, if principle it is, the Majority ought to allow divorce

when both husband and wife agree in desiring it, or if one of them has contracted an "invincible aversion" for the other.

Why then do not the Majority make provision for cases like these, which are so evidently covered by their own formula? They answer this question themselves with engaging candour. "These suggestions," they say, "are not likely to meet with any substantial support at the present day in England."\* In other words, their omission of proposals for divorce by consent is not due to any objection in principle, but simply to opportunism; to the lack of popular demand *at the present time*. But if the 1857 legislation resulted, after fifty years, in such additional demands as the Majority Report endorses, we can hardly doubt that a generation which has grown up under the new conditions will demand yet further facilities. And the demand will be justified, partly because there is no principle at all to be pleaded against it by those who approve the present proposals, and partly because the provision of divorce for "desertion" and "cruelty" will already have given the further facilities to all parties who do not shrink from collusion. We must emphasise once more two points which we have already made; first, that such collusion in cases of "desertion" and "cruelty" has become a normal and tolerated practice in America; and secondly, as the results of the 1857 Act abundantly show, any extension

\* Report P. 113. There is a damaging criticism, to which I am much indebted, by the Minority; Report, pp. 184 f.



of the grounds for divorce soon comes to be used for cases which the law was never intended to cover. It follows that the proposals of the Majority Report must be resisted not only by "traditionalist" Christians, but by all who would stop short where the Majority themselves profess to stop short. When so fundamental an institution as marriage is at stake, thoughtful men must refuse to support a programme which lacks any clear and consistent principle. And we are bound to reiterate our own belief that no clear and consistent principle can be found between the two extremes of indissoluble marriage and divorce by consent.

## II. HARD CASES MAKE BAD LAW

No one with a spark of humanity in him would wish for one moment to under-rate the hard lot which misfortunes in married life have imposed upon thousands of men and women. We know and deplore the existence of all this unhappiness; indeed, as Christians we go further, and acknowledge that such unhappiness is the greatest unhappiness that there can be, just because home life at its best is so wonderfully beautiful and holy. *Corruptio optimi pessima.*

So we do not use the maxim quoted above in any light-hearted disregard of the hard cases which are rightly pressed upon our attention; and we hope that the attitude of Christians towards them will always be one of the deepest tenderness and sympathy. But the maxim remains sound;

hard cases do make bad law. To maintain this is not to take refuge in inaction ; it is not to deny that the hard cases require treatment. Our point is simply that any legislation which sacrifices the welfare of by far the greater part of the nation to the supposed interests of the afflicted minority, violates what should be a fundamental principle of all legislation.

Now the advocates of divorce gain most of their support precisely by violating this principle. They pile up before our eyes case after case of hardship, and thereby inevitably, however innocently, give a worse impression than the facts justify. To take a very humble analogy : even the most moderate smoker is smitten by a sense of extravagance, when he sees a year's supply of tobacco tins standing empty before him. For he is confronted only by the evidence of his expenditure ; there is no evidence of the days and weeks during which nothing has been spent. The resulting impression is one-sided and therefore false. Similarly, when we are confronted with all these cases of hardship, we do not get a balanced and comprehensive impression of existing conditions unless we add to each instance of matrimonial failure some hundreds of cases of matrimonial success. We must not allow the reality and urgency of the sad cases to prevent us from seeing the real field steadily and whole. We must not allow popular sentiment to be played upon by a parade of desertions, cruelties, incurable lunatics, hopeless drunkards, and long-sentence convicts without pointing out that the vast majority of husbands and wives do not fall

under any of these condemnations. The appeal to sentiment has its proper place, but it is no substitute for a considered judgment on the whole problem.

It is also worth remembering that by far the greater part of unhappiness in married life springs not from unpreventable causes, but from rash and light-hearted marriages ; marriages contracted not "discreetly, advisedly, soberly and in the fear of God," to use the words of the Prayer Book, but "unadvisedly, lightly," and perhaps "wantonly." Now if this is true under the present law, is it not evident that further relaxation of the law, however well-intentioned, will make the check on such marriages proportionately weaker ? The more easily divorce can be obtained, the less careful thought will there be about entering into the married state ; and the less careful thought there is about entering into the married state, the more unhappy marriages there will be ; and the more unhappy marriages there are, the wider demand will there be for fresh facilities of divorce. The whole process would become a vicious circle ; but there will be no escape from it if in our divorce legislation, we disregard, the vital principle that hard cases make bad law.

### III. MARRIAGE RESTS ON A RECIPROCAL VOW OF LOYALTY, AND IS NOT A MERE COMMERCIAL BARGAIN.

Marriage is certainly a contract ; but it is also very much more than a contract. The advocates of

divorce, however, shew with decisive and deplorable clearness that they regard it not as a holy estate, but as a mere bargain between two parties, for their mutual advantage. In this case it follows that either husband or wife should be allowed to repudiate the bargain, if untoward circumstances arise. If, however, marriage is not a mere arrangement of convenience, but a reciprocal vow of lifelong loyalty, then it must be of perpetual obligation. The Prayer Book Marriage Service, which has been used in more than 60 per cent. of existing marriages in England, is most emphatic on this point. Husband and wife vow to take each other and cleave to each other until *death* parts them, whatever hardships may lie before them: "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health." Even in purely civil marriages\* the vow 'I do take thee to be my wife (husband)' assumes essentially the same obligations.† It is a solemn vow of loyalty; a vow which both parties are on their honour to observe.

This vital character of the marriage relationship is ignored by the advocates of divorce. They have much to say about the rights and claims of a husband or wife, but very little about the obligations imposed upon them by loyalty and honour.

\* About twenty per cent. of the total number.

† The present State Law regards marriage as indissoluble except in cases of adultery; and the "civil" vow must be interpreted in this sense. If the new proposals become law, the "civil" vow will then involve no more than "I take thee to be my wife (husband) so long as I find it convenient to do so."

They appeal continually not to the higher elements of human nature but to the lower; as though self-interest were the one human characteristic worth taking into account, and therefore a solemn vow, freely and deliberately taken, should cease to be binding as soon as the duty of keeping it becomes particularly irksome. May we not rather say that men and women of honour will feel called to an even intenser loyalty under such conditions, and will think it better and nobler to suffer for their loyalty than to abandon it? The sacredness of the marriage bond is a great cause; and no great cause can be maintained without suffering. One who endures in this spirit will be sustained by the remembrance of his own free and willing vow, instead of feeling chafed by the fetters of a mere bargain, which has turned out badly, but cannot be repudiated.

This view of the matter may be dismissed as idealistic and unpractical. We do not feel disposed to apologize for having ideals; and inasmuch as the vow of life-long loyalty is essential to the marriage contract, it is more practical to treat it seriously than to ignore its existence. It should not be too much to ask of any reformer that he should first understand the nature of that which he proposes to reform.

IV. THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL IS JUSTIFIED BY ITS  
ACTUAL ACHIEVEMENTS.

The Christian appeal to divine authority is ruled out by the advocates of divorce as a theological weapon of an irrational and arbitrary nature; they refuse to be fettered by texts and dogmas. But they can hardly refuse to look at history and see what in fact the Christian ideal has accomplished. Even the most bigoted opponent of dogmas does not carry his dislike of that highly dogmatic principle called the law of gravitation beyond certain limits; he may profess to regard the dogma as academic, but he will not show defiance by leaving his house through the first floor window instead of the front door. He knows that the facts of experience are all against the wisdom of such an enterprise.

We are entitled, then, to say to modern advocates of divorce:—Do not trouble yourselves about New Testament texts, but do be sufficiently practical to see what the actual results of the Christian marriage ideal have been in history. Do not think we are forcing upon you the dogma of our Lord's Divinity; but do be candid enough to realise that the faith which enshrines that dogma has had a profound effect upon mankind.

Christianity, in fact, has given us the Christian home. It came into a world in which divorce and re-marriage were freely and fully allowed; and against the most fundamental passion of human nature it established a new social and domestic order *on the foundation of indissoluble marriage.*

From that new and far-reaching principle has sprung all that we mean by chivalry, all the noblest ideals of womanhood; just as from the equally Christian principle of human brotherhood and freedom has sprung the impulse which abolished slavery.

The Church's battle for indissoluble marriage was always hard from the moment that Christianity became the "established" religion of the Roman Empire; so hard, that the Eastern Church settled down to a sad compromise with the secular authorities. The Western Church however, never deserted its ideal, in spite of occasional lapses; and it is to the Western Church that Western civilisation owes almost all that has made it sound and noble. Nowhere is our debt greater than in this vital sphere of sex relationships. Christian home life has been built up on the law of indissoluble marriage; and it does not require a dogmatic bias to realise that Christian home life is the most priceless of national possessions. But it is passing strange that men who see on what it has been built should regard the destruction of its foundations as a harmless embellishment.

## §5 SEPARATION OR DIVORCE?

It is against "separation" that the advocates of divorce direct their strongest assault. We may turn once more to Lord Buckmaster's article in the *Spectator* for a typical utterance.

"Separation," he says, "has no justification except in the old ecclesiastical idea that you may dissolve

a marriage in every respect except in the one matter that the parties remain married. Every right, every duty, every privilege, every consideration which establishes married life may be utterly destroyed, and the destruction rendered permanent by a decree of separation ; but the parties concerned are to go through life injured and lame, without any chance whatever of trying to begin anew . . . the condition so created is one of the utmost temptation to the woman and to the man. It is a condition for which no authority whatever is to be found in Scripture. It is merely a compromise between the claims of justice and the claims of the Church."

The main reason for this indignant attack is that the existence of separation removes altogether most of the reasons for divorce. By providing a remedy in cases of desertion and cruelty and habitual drunkenness it nullifies all arguments for divorce which are based on the misery caused in such cases. The deserting husband is compelled to support the wife he has deserted ; while the partner of a cruel or drunken spouse is relieved from a cohabitation which has become intolerable. The demand for liberation has been satisfied ; the tyranny is overpast.

And then we find that the demand is not for liberation but for re-marriage ; and so Lord Buckmaster has to represent separation as an almost greater evil than the miseries which it has ended. We will first examine his arguments, and then offer further reasons for preferring separation to divorce.



1. "Separation has no justification except in the old ecclesiastical idea that you may dissolve a marriage in every respect except in the one matter that the parties still remain married."

We have said enough already about the law of indissoluble marriage to be excused from discussing here whether it is adequately described as an "old ecclesiastical idea." But it is in fact the living conviction of the Western Church, to-day as in the past; and the theological witnesses before the Commission, however they interpreted the Matthaean\* exception, were unanimous in maintaining that the ideal of indissoluble marriage comes from our Lord Himself. Assuming then that an idea is not necessarily discredited because it is "old" and "ecclesiastical"—Lord Buckmaster avoids the less invidious terms "well tried" and "Christian"—we may be allowed to judge it on its merits. And it amounts to this: that however much disease or human wickedness may interfere with the full enjoyment of married life, they cannot undo the marriage itself. A natural relationship has been set up, and cannot be repudiated. The vow has been made and cannot be unmade. On this point we need not repeat what we said in the last section. But it is curious to find "the one matter that the parties still remain married" treated as a quite negligible technicality.

Separation, then, so far from having "no justification," which is not ecclesiastical and out-

\*See Appendix.

worn, has the great moral merit of insisting on fidelity to vows, while releasing husband or wife from conditions of domestic misery.

2. "Every right, every duty, every privilege, every consideration, which establishes married life, may be utterly destroyed, and the destruction rendered permanent by a decree of separation."

The suggestion that "separation" means the permanent destruction of married life is false. That is precisely what "separation" does not mean. We have pointed out already that it leaves the way of reconciliation perpetually open, and refuses to ignore the possibility of repentance on the part of the offending husband or wife. This again is a very great moral merit. Perhaps it will be said that the point is purely academic, and that in practice reconciliations do not take place. Fortunately, the facts show that the reconciliations are very frequent. "The evidence has made it overwhelmingly clear," says the *Minority Report*, \* "that these (separation) orders in most cases remain in effective force for a short time only . . . A great many orders which have been made are never taken up by the applicants . . . There are said to be 4,000 such orders at Leeds alone." Most of the witnesses before the commission estimated the number of reconciliations at above 50 per cent. We may add that more than half the applications have been withdrawn almost at once in cases where the magistrate has begun by urging reconciliation on the applicants, and referred

\* *Report*, p. 178.

them to the Court Missionary. It is not surprising to find Mr. Paul Taylor, the London Magistrate, writing in 1910, amazed that "any such proposal (as would substitute divorce for separation) could be made by anyone acquainted with the facts." \*

3. "The parties are to go through life injured and lame, without any chance whatever of trying to begin anew."

We dealt with this difficulty in the preceding section (headings I. and III.). We need only note here that separation does give both parties every chance of trying to begin anew, albeit on the basis of their own vow of loyalty. Meanwhile separation is a salutary restraint on the offending party, which prevents him or her from ruining a second marriage; in this case we remain unmoved by Lord Buckmaster's pathetic adjectives—"injured and lame."

4. "The condition so created is one of the utmost temptation to the woman and to the man."

Lord Buckmaster here hints at the depressing belief—which has been stated more crudely by another ex-Lord Chancellor—that chastity is an impracticable ideal. The view of marriage implied in this belief goes far to explain the modern readiness to dissolve the marriage-bond so lightly. But the belief is not true. Nor is it true that separations lead to immorality. Mr. Paul Taylor, in the letter above mentioned, says that there is no evidence for this opinion, and that he himself has

\* *Daily Telegraph*, August 23rd, 1910. Quoted by Mr. Kenneth Ingram, op. cit., p. 69.

“very rarely indeed been asked to discharge a separation order on the ground of the wife’s misconduct.” Moreover, enquiries have been made of all the clerks to justices throughout England and Wales, to ask “whether in their opinion it has been proved, or there is reason to suppose, that the grant of orders of separation leads to immorality. Out of 141 replies to this question 104 are in the negative.\*

5. “Separation” is a condition for which no authority whatever is to be found in Scripture. It is merely a compromise between the claims of justice and the claims of the Church.”

We are bound to point out that both these statements are directly contrary to the facts. We have refrained from pressing Biblical and ecclesiastical arguments, but if Lord Buckmaster appeals to Scripture, to Scripture let him go. S. Paul writes thus:† “Unto the married I give charge, yea, not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband (but if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife.” What is this charge of S. Paul’s—which is also, in his opinion, our Lord’s—but the permission for husband and wife to separate in case of necessity, together with an absolute prohibition of remarriage?

Moreover, we have seen ‡ that divorce “a mensa

\* Report, p. 179.

† I Cor. VII, 10 f. R.V.

‡ Section I.

et thoro"—which is the ecclesiastical equivalent of separation—has been and is allowed by the Church in cases of need. "The claims of the Church" are not compromised but endorsed when separation is allowed and divorce (with the right of re-marriage) forbidden. Church and State differ not in this matter, but in the State's permitting divorce and re-marriage for adultery. As for "the claims of justice," it has been our plea throughout that, while perfect justice is unattainable in human society, it will be secured far more completely by refusing further facilities for divorce than by granting them.

There is therefore no firm ground in any of Lord Buckmaster's indictments. We may conclude this section by a brief glance at some further points in which separation is far preferable to divorce.

Separation gives the relief which justice requires in the cases of real hardship; but in doing so it definitely treats them as exceptional, and definitely holds that the hardship does not justify the breaking of a solemn vow freely and willingly taken.

Separation not only leaves open the door to reconciliation and amendment, but it strongly urges this best of all "fresh starts" by barring the entry to a second "marriage."

Where the hope of re-marriage, allowed by divorce, would act as an incentive to a fickle spouse, the prospect of separation, which forbids re-marriage, persuades him to make the best of his present condition.

It is claimed for divorce that it gives the injured party the compensation due to him, i.e. the oppor-

tunity of a fresh marriage; but it also gives the same reward to the offending party, and for his very offence; it lets him know that if only he is sufficiently callous or cruel or unfaithful he can get rid of his present mate and choose another. Separation rules out this direct encouragement of vice.

Finally, separation makes for the stability of home life by its insistence that the marriage tie is permanently binding, and not dissoluble in half a dozen ways; and it guards, so far as circumstances allow, the natural rights of the children of a marriage and their abiding claim\* upon both their parents.

## §6 THE DUTY OF CHURCHMEN.

It is sufficiently clear that obedience to our Lord prevents us from accepting as valid, except in the bare legal sense, any ratification which Parliament may give to the proposals of the Divorce Law reformers; nor can the Church condone adultery by extending any sanction whatsoever to the new "marriages" of divorced persons, or by admitting them to Communion when thus "married." Immorality does not become morality by virtue of legislation, even in a country where the Church is Established. If the State insists on following the retrograde path marked out for it by the Majority Report, we must, it would seem, resign ourselves to a condition of affairs in which all

\* More could have been said about this claim of the children had space permitted. It is one of the most obvious and most vital principles violated by the advocates of easy divorce.

marriages will be civil functions, while only couples of definitely Christian convictions will seek the Church's blessing on their union. This solution of the difficulty is widely advocated to-day, and has certain attractions. It draws a sharp line between Christian and civil marriages, and provides for a delimitation of spheres with the least possible risk of friction.

And the time may come when no other *modus vivendi* will be possible. But the present writer ventures to disagree with those who would welcome it; and with those who have no eagerness to resist the modern advocacy of divorce, on the ground that you cannot morally impose Christian standards on a population which is not genuinely Christian.

It is true that we cannot expect our fellow-countrymen to obey a Teacher in Whom they do not believe, or a Church to which they do not belong. This is the reason why the preceding pages have endeavoured to stress not the obvious fact that the proposed divorce facilities are contrary to our Lord's authority and to Catholic tradition and belief, but the further fact that they are also contrary to sound policy and the moral welfare of the nation as a whole. There are masses of thoughtful men who will listen to reason, though they may have no ecclesiastical or even religious allegiance at all. Therefore let us do our best to show them that reason is on our side in this matter, and not on the side of our opponents. We have an overwhelmingly strong case on the practical ground of social and moral expediency; let us make the most of it. If we

can win converts on this neutral territory, we shall also have done something to commend the Christian Religion : we shall have shewn that in this practical and vital matter the Church has occupied the right and sane position, and has done so in obedience to her Lord. Then, if the campaign is successful, and the Christian standard retained—except in so far as the existing law has departed from it—its retention will not have been imposed upon an unwilling country by an ecclesiastical agitation, but welcomed on its own merits as the soundest practical policy.

There is no need to emphasise the excellence of such a result. And it is a result which we may well hope to attain, if we work for it. The divorce campaign is not a genuinely popular movement ; it has met with far less favour from the Commons than from the Lords, and the evidence given before the Commission, “so far from showing any great or general demand on the part of the poorer classes for [further facilities of divorce], very clearly proves the absence of any such demand.” \* Popular opinion will be ready to welcome the Church’s lead in defence of the home and the marriage-tie.

Moreover an unresisting acquiescence in a dual standard for Marriage—“Christian” and “non-Christian”—seems to be ruled out for us by our Lord’s own words. He did not merely set aside the Mosaic regulations which owed their existence to the hardness of men’s hearts, and then introduce

\* Report, p. 176 ; where the great strength and significance of this evidence is admirably shewn.



a new standard of His own: but He clearly explained that He was going behind the Mosaic legislation to the original purpose of God—the purpose which existed “from the beginning.” Marriage in fact is a *natural* union, based on a natural law inherent in creation itself. The principle of indissolubility, as taught by Our Lord, is an affirmation that Marriage is indissoluble not merely by His own new ordinance but in the very nature of things; “it is a natural union, as intimate and indestructible as that of parent and child,”\* and terminable therefore only in the course of nature, i.e. by death. Marriage, in fine, does not merely acquire the character of indissolubility when it becomes a sacrament of the Church—i.e. when it is a union of baptized persons—but it possesses that character by nature and “from the beginning of creation.”

It follows that the true defence of Marriage is a defence not merely of ecclesiastical laws and dogmas, nor even merely of Christian ethics, but of the natural rights and liberties of mankind at large. It may indeed happen that our campaign will fail, because of the hardness of men’s hearts; but that possibility is no excuse for narrowing our vision and our cause at this early and still hopeful stage. The battle is the Lord’s; we must fight it, as far as in us lies, along the whole wide front which His own principle embraces.

At the same time we must lose no opportunity of holding up the full Christian ideal of marriage. Here the main burden must rest, as usual, on the

\* Lacey: *Marriage in Church and State*, p. 18.

already over-worked parochial clergy. One method of inestimable value may be mentioned here ; it is that when couples come to have their banns put up, the priest should explain to them the marriage service and all its implications. In large parishes it is very difficult to do this in every case, but the attempt is well worth the labour involved, and it makes for friendship and trust as well as for sound instruction in a vital matter. Nor are we acting fairly when we allow husbands and wives to take unprepared the tremendous vow of life-long loyalty. We must do all that we can, then, to urge them to consecrate to God's service both their own individual lives, and the home life which they are to share together.

If only we could persuade men and women to regard marriage as a vocation ; to seek divine guidance for themselves therein through prayer ; to reverence with holy awe the mystery which symbolizes Christ's indissoluble union with the Church ; to grasp the sacramental character of married life, and the utter degradation of it when the union is not moral and spiritual as well as physical ; if we could make them realise that love cannot be firmly grounded where God is not ; that the truest safeguard of domestic happiness is to welcome Jesus Christ always and in all things to the home : if we could secure all this, then we should have cut at the root of the desire for easier divorce, and set before men's eyes a true picture of the Christian home, than which there is nothing in the world more beautiful and more holy.

## PROSTITUTION.

BY REV. FATHER ANDREW, S.D.C.

IF one might imagine the possession of a fairy philtre that would make the person who drank some drops of its potion tell forthwith the absolute truth, and if, further, one might wrap oneself in an invisible cloak and so, standing by the side of some self-indulgent man, add to his glass the magic of this tincture, one would hear, surely, some such speech as this: "This is my body and it shall have whatever sensation it desires, food and wine and sumptuous clothing; hands shall work that it may be idle, and for its further pleasure shall be sacrificed what scruple of conscience might prompt a woman to refuse its satisfaction." We do not like to face the truth, but there is no exaggeration in this picture. And if in our fairy flight we passed on to some small-souled woman and drew from her by the same magic a confession of her mind, should we not hear: "This is my body and it shall have its meed of admiration; age shall be kept from it and every pain; it shall be petted and powdered and painted; it is for sensation of pleasure and triumph, but never travail; this is my body which is given for me."

Now let us leave fancy and get to fact. Let us try to realise reality and place ourselves at that scene, the truth of which has burnt itself into the

memory and experience of all Christians, and hear Christ at the holy table of His Supper saying : " This is My Body which is given for you."

These considerations may form a prologue for our thoughts on this unsavoury subject of prostitution. It is a subject which we must face with wisdom, humility, and courage, as in honour bound to Him Who taught us that the body is His Body and that it is an instrument of sacrifice, in other words, a thing to be "made holy" (*sacrum facio* to interpret literally the word sacrifice), and Who communicates to us in His sacrament the power and purity of His own sacred, risen, victorious Humanity.

Professor Illingworth says somewhere that there is a romance about sanctity because you never know what a saint will do or say next. But there is no romance about sinning, for sin always follows the same sordid path, and you always know what a sinner will do next. This is true : "Of prostitution more than anything else it may be said," writes Flexner, "there is nothing new under the sun."

It is well to say at the start that there is a good deal of loose and foolish talk about "self-expression," and a very false glamour is often thrown over a life of irregularity. Professor Lecky, in his "History of European Morals" for instance, speaks of the prostitute as of a priestess of morality who by her sacrifice protects the morality of other women! We shall only approach the problem rightly if we understand its psychology; so we shall want wisdom to see the truth, humility (for

which of us can throw the first stone?), and courage to face a horrible thing of immense power to hurt our own and every generation. We shall do well to see the hideousness of prostitution, the dragon we are out to slay, and all the pathos of the prostitute, a sad Andromeda, chained in her nakedness, whom we are out to save.

Prostitution is a matter of supply and demand; statistics, as well as one can get them, show that the two react upon each other. Where there is demand, supply rises to meet it; where the supply fails the demand dies down. Where there is no demand and the suggestion is wanting, there the evil phenomenon disappears. A careful study of the problem shows that legal measures and police action can really do nothing; the problem is one of personal psychology. The man we have pictured, who has learnt to think that his body was made to be an instrument of pleasure, will soon demand the addition of sex gratification to that of his palate and his other senses; the woman of the same type will help to produce the atmosphere in which the dominant force is a craving for sensation; a careless public opinion, lacking the asset of vital moral conviction, will complete the setting for the scene of the garden of temptation in which Adam is for ever meeting Eve.

Some women are primarily mothers; their whole instinct is protective; their husbands, their children, their occupations, are all invested with a sense of dependence; it would never occur to them to be other than those whose business it is to create and preserve. Some women are

primarily wives; their instinct is to yield themselves. The present writer knew of one such who gave herself to a man in marriage, and then, feeling she was in his way, committed suicide, justifying herself with the text "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friends" which was found written in her diary on the day of her self murder. It is of such that are made, perhaps, the greatest saints and the greatest sinners. Probably not many keep a perfect balance between the two instincts; some have little consciousness of either, and if these sin, their sin is peculiarly sordid.

Probably it is true to say that our personality can express itself on three planes: the physical, which we share with the animals and so, though innocent essentially, still the lowest plane, the mental or moral, which is higher, and the spiritual or ideal which is highest. If physical desire is to dominate mental and moral approval then we descend to the level, and below the level, of the animal world; if the spiritual cannot transcend the simply moral we may have perfect bourgeois respectability, but we shall never be saints. Divorce, for instance, might be shown to be morally right: it could never be shown to be ideally right, and what is not ideally right could never be the Divine Will. However much the Church might be moved to compassion over hard cases, she never could depart from her ideal of the permanence of marriage and keep her vision of her destiny as the Bride of Christ. A very excellent contribution to right thought on

this matter will be found in an article by Professor Felix Adler, one who is not a churchman, and therefore writes without any preconceptions or prejudices, in the *Hibbert Journal* for October of this year, 1928. "The question, where self-expression is raised as an issue, is which of your selves do you desire to express?" he writes, and by this he means not that one has more than one self, but that there are these three aspects, or what we have called planes, the lower, the higher, and the highest. One is not first man, but a soul, a personality, and if one wants a perfect liberty it will only be if the soul with its ideal, or God-consciousness, dominates every other consciousness. So, if the mind is to be free, the body may have to be in bondage, and if the soul is to be free, then sometimes the mind must yield its limited considerations to the richer vision of the soul. In Germany it has been pretty well an accepted fact that sexual indulgence is a physiological necessity: such an opinion is both a devil's lie and a physiological inaccuracy. A man who indulges himself wrongly does not express himself, he denies himself, showing himself to be something which he is not, a creature with the image of a man rather than a man made in the image of God. It is not strange that if what Flexner, who is a great expert on the statistics of this distressing phenomenon, says is true, Berlin should have an unenviable primacy in provision of opportunity for irregular indulgence, since Berlin displaced Christ and took Nietzsche as the guide to its mentality. Nietzsche makes dominant the perfection of self-expression.

To him to live for self at the expense of others is a true philosophy ; for the Christian the ideal must be to live for others at the expense of self.

In our Lord's temptation the first struggle is between the soul and the body ; the body craves sensation at the expense of the soul's obedience. The soul vanquishes the lower claim and triumphs in obedience to the Will of God. The second struggle is between the soul and the imagination. A victory through display is suggested ; the soul decides on a victory through patience, " Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The third struggle is between the soul and the career ; " after all," is the suggestion, " you *must* succeed." The soul decides that " blessedness," not " success," is the end to be desired ; no fear of a cross nor bribe of a crown shall persuade a turning from the way of the Divine Will. Here is true spirituality, true self-expression. A consideration of these principles will help us to understand the psychology which will be the true solution of the problem before us, and the violation of which has produced it.

Bishop Creighton once said : " The problem of the future is the Discipline of Liberty " ; put in another way one can affirm that the problem of the future is : " What are men going to obey ? "

There have always been prostitutes, but in the mediaeval city such were marked women. They were, in the main, of two varieties : the resident, who lived in a regular house kept for the purpose, and the itinerant camp follower, who followed in the rear of the great processional movements that for



warlike or even religious ends swept across the mediaeval world. The distinction between the vicious and the virtuous woman was clearly seen in the small communities when Paris held but 200,000 and London 35,000 inhabitants. Then, if the harlot plied her trade secretly her true character was quickly known, if professionally, her garb, appearance, and abode, proclaimed her for what she was. There was then, as well as reckless indulgence, a real belief in penitence and sanctity, and the pressure of definite opinion, religious sanctions and religious condemnations functioned effectively. To-day, unless a man hearken to the voice which speaks in his own soul, there may be little outward help from opinion or environment. Now, instead of 35,000, London numbers in itself, apart from its suburbs, 7,252,963 inhabitants, and into it and into every large town are constantly poured thousands of young men and women, more or less irresponsible, to earn a living under conditions that so far from strengthening character weaken every resistance to evil. The question is insistent: what power are these going to obey? External authority has less and less power; it is a question of character training and the recognition of a Christian conscience, the building up of a wholesome public opinion. The problem is a very different one to-day from what it has been, and, like all present-day problems, it shows us our solidarity as a human family and how it is the concern of all of us to face it and fight it.

To define a prostitute one would say that she is a woman who has got to a state of emotional in-

difference, so that she is ready to barter her body for gain promiscuously. Here is the difference between profane and sacred union: on the one hand, emotional indifference, promiscuity, barter, irresponsibility, on the other, high emotional sanction, mutual respect and faithfulness and deliberate responsibility for the result.

The evils that follow in the train of the prostitute are personal demoralisation, economic waste, disease. The prostitute contracts disease very quickly, and, even if she herself may be cured, she, none the less, may be a carrier of disease unknown to herself. It is not possible really to have a Contagious Diseases Act of any efficiency, even if it were, as it certainly is not, desirable for other reasons than purposes of hygiene, for it is impossible to diagnose satisfactorily the physical state of anyone who lives a life of sexual promiscuity.

The present writer has known in his ministry several cases of men who have been stricken down with disease through intercourse with women who, though examined by doctors both before and after the acts of intercourse, showed no trace of infection. To take these three evils separately, it may suffice to say on the score of disease that 10,000 individuals are now annually treated for venereal complaints in the public hospitals of Berlin alone. Any philosophic appreciation of the sameness of conditions in large towns and the general unity of human nature will enable a thinker to realise something of the awful spread of a vile infection which this evil is disseminating in our day. We give the Berlin statistics just because they are

easier to get at and seem to have been more accurately kept than in other places, tabulation being precious to the German mind. As to personal demoralisation we may quote again Professor Adler writing, not about prostitution but about divorce; *a fortiori* his words will apply with greater emphasis to our subject. He writes: "To advocate impermanence in the sex relation for the sake of a more varied gratification of the sex instinct would be to reduce man to the animal level, since in a life thus lived, a disorderly, dissipated life, the mind, being uneasily set on sense gratification, the higher faculties, those of the thinker, the artist, the man of affairs would stand no chance; the lower grovelling purposes would fill the horizon, the things that count from the human point of view would be out of the picture. Moreover, the general mental instability that goes with such an existence is unfavourable to that concentration which is so essential to valid achievement in art, science or business. The unbinding of the animal instincts blocks the way to the exercise of the higher faculties."

As regards economic waste we have first to consider the unnatural sterility of these multitudes of women and all the frivolous expenditure caused by them which serves no good end for any productive trade. A German authority, Losh, has reckoned "the annual cost of prostitution to the German Empire at something between 3,000 and 5,000 million marks." This, of course, is pre-war reckoning and "may be contrasted with that spent by the Prussian Government on its entire

educational system, technical and professional institutions of all kinds involving a budget in 1909 of a little less than 20,000,000 marks. Assuredly the economic burden imposed on society by prostitution is comparable with that due to standing armies, war or pestilence."

There is another hateful subject that has to be faced; it may be dealt with here as a parenthesis, and as Flexner, the great authority on the subject, treats of it both with brevity and accuracy it will suffice to do little more than quote what he says, and one must confess that in the whole matter one loves least to let one's mind dwell on this "Prostitution in Europe as an organised business is by no means limited to the intercourse of persons of opposite sexes. A homosexual prostitution—prostitution, that is, in which the parties belong to the same sex—has developed on a considerable scale. Notorious resorts for this indulgence are to be found, not only in Paris, but in small towns like Hamburg. Berlin is, however, probably the main mart. In prominent thoroughfares bars exist to which only women resort as well as bars to which no woman gets access . . . It is estimated that between 1,000 and 2,000 male prostitutes live in Berlin; 40 homosexual resorts are tolerated by the Berlin police; and it is reported that some 30,000 persons of marked homosexual inclination reside in the German capital." The writer's own experience in dealing with male penitents who have come to him and who, in genuine contrition have given him leave to make use of their revelations, leads him to the unhappy con-

clusion that this evil is growing in London. There is a kind of freemasonry among these men who meet one another in the conveniences that are provided for men in the city. It is common for two of a type to recognise one another in one of the more public places of accommodation; then one of the parties will walk to another more secluded place, such as may be found in the Temple, followed by his fellow. Every place of convenience for men is apparently known to these unhappy victims of unnatural desire. To these men a woman has no appeal, and apart from this vice and with another man who is immune to the temptation they are very likely amiable and accomplished. This vice seems to be a kind of obsession; it is harder to deal with than any other kind of immorality; historically, alas, it has always gone before the fall of a nation. There can be no finer patriotism than to enlist oneself in the cause of purity among men.

Writing this paper is an exercise in humility. One feels little pride in a manhood that can descend to such depths. One will try to end with hope as the Psalm does, but, for a while, it must be "de profundis" that one's words come.

The prostitute is attended often by a terrible person, "the pimp." This is the man who lives upon her earnings and, as a rule, treats her brutally. The existence of this creature, who is no protection to her, for the police have no mercy on him if they discover him and are not duped into accepting the tale that he is the woman's husband, is a strange witness to a fundamental fact of sex

relation. The prostitute has no feeling of any kind towards the men who in their multitudes use her body for their gratification; but the pimp belongs to her; her fidelity to him is a pathetic aberration of her true woman's instinct. The police say that they can never get a conviction against a pimp from the woman he lives on. He is to her in some dim sense a husband; some vestige of affection, some feeling that he belongs to her surrounds him; she is ready to pay the price of accepting ill-treatment from him for the sake of the perverted phantom of self-respect that his evil shadow somehow evokes.

We get an idea of the class that prostitutes mainly come from from statistics carefully made by the Munich police. Of 2,574 well known to them, 721 were servants, 608 waitresses, 250 factory workers, 246 seamstresses, 60 were connected with the stage, 52 were laundresses, 40 dress-makers, 23 other types, some of these artists' models. The writer can testify from his own experience as an art student that it is not from the ranks of those associated with art that the sad army is much recruited. He has known many models and never, personally, one who was impure; it is true that his experience did not lie chiefly either in Paris or London, and the models of whom he had knowledge were chivalrously watched over by the Professors of Art Schools; nor has he known amongst English chorus girls, as a class and speaking generally, much surrender of ideals of purity.

In Paris and continental towns professional prostitutes are supposed to be inscribed. Accord-

ing to the French police this means that perhaps one in three of those who are altogether given up to this dreary calling are on their books. But much more dangerous than the professional is what is known as the clandestine prostitute. A woman is none the less a prostitute if she will barter herself promiscuously, though she does not dwell in a house entirely given over to that purpose. The statistics given above, collected by the Munich police, were all of this clandestine type; many of them kept up the semblance of a calling as a blind to what was their real following. The inscription and examination of women is futile for this reason, that the large army of clandestines do not come under a scheme of tabulation and they are much more dangerous than the professional women. Here are the figures given in a consulting room in Harley Street by an eminent doctor, taken from medical experience at three London hospitals during the war. At the first hospital, 13 per cent. cases of infection from venereal diseases came from the professional street walker, the remaining 87 from careless girls and light women who had yielded themselves to the folly of a night. At the second, 17 per cent., and at the third 47 per cent. of the patients owed their diseases to the professional harlot, the balance again to careless girls and women. In no case, so the doctor declared with great emphasis, was the balance on the side of the professional prostitutes.

Doctors who have to treat venereal diseases have certain statistics ready to their hand, and in

towns where the profession of a prostitute is inscribed, inadequate statistics are in the hands of the police. London is not a town in which inscription is the rule; in other words, in London prostitution is treated as a vice and not as a crime, and yet London compares favourably with continental towns. In towns where inscription is the rule prostitution is, in theory, treated as a crime if it is clandestine and condoned if it is professional. We have already shown, and the point need not be laboured for it is medically certain, that a "Contagious Diseases Act" is worse than useless in combating this evil. It is now time, and it is well that a man should be doing it, to protest against the injustice that has allowed all regulation and legislation to be favourable to the man who takes his pleasure from the prostitute, and has never been framed with any consideration for the woman who is his victim.

Why in the name of the commonest justice should there be one law for the woman and another for the man? Why in the name of the crudest kind of chivalry should there be law for the woman and no law for the man? A preacher once owned to his congregation that his life had not been without its black chapter and took the people to whom he gave his message so far into his confidence as to own to a tarnished past. A woman who sought his advice afterwards said to him: "People think it honest of you to own to wild oats, but if a woman did so she would not be so easily forgiven." One cannot deny the truth of this. Why should one talk about a "fallen



woman " and not apply the same term to a man ? Why should a woman be inscribed and not a man, a woman watched and not a man, a woman examined and not a man, precautions taken to guard the man and no precautions taken to guard the woman ? The sex question is very largely a woman's question ; there is every hope that now women have a voice in local government as well as the opportunity of representation in Parliament they will not rest under the injustice with which their poor sisters have been treated, and will find true champions for their deliverance.

It is not only the actual evil which must be dealt with, but the indirect causes, want of education, impure literature, obscene pictures (the present writer was once taking a mission in a South London parish ; a man came to him who made his living by the sale of filthy photographs ; 400 of these were destroyed in real penitence and at considerable cost), and overcrowding. That gallant couple, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, in their book, "The Prevention of Destitution," write as follows : "The herding together, by day and night, of men and women, of young and old, of boys and girls, of all degrees of relationship and no relationship, not only destroys health but makes, to the ordinary human being, the particular virtue on which the integrity of the family depends wholly impracticable. Any person who has dwelt among the denizens of the slums, cannot fail to have brought home to him the existence of a stratum of society of no inconsiderable magnitude in which children part with their innocence long

before puberty, in which personal chastity is virtually unknown, and in which 'to have a baby by your father' is laughed at as a comic mishap." It is often the lot of the social worker to receive the confidence of a girl who is in terror of her father, and to contrive ways of helping children violated by a parent. Mothers who ought to be set free to follow the vocation of motherhood, to nurse and train the children they have brought into the world, are driven out to work while the children are left to neighbours and the streets. The talk and gossip, "the loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind," the low standard of marriage and the chatter about the doings of the Divorce Court all produce the atmosphere congenial to evil growths and tend to give children that character which will surely go under sooner or later. "Through some English Rescue Homes, 745 children between eight and fifteen years of age passed in the course of three years"; these facts are quoted from the report of the Chief Constable for the year ending December 31st, 1909. Of 1,882 prostitutes arrested on the streets of Glasgow for drunkenness or soliciting, seven were between fourteen and sixteen, and 314 between sixteen and twenty-one. Could any man who realised that such was the danger and such the fate of so many of his "little sisters," as S. Francis would have called them, fail to feel the chivalry in him stirred to its depths or be deaf to the call to do all in his power to give gallant battle to this dragon of evil?

The prostitute is a victim of every kind of deception. Probably she begins by giving what

later she learns to sell. Then she swiftly slips into the slavery of the system that must very quickly kill her unless she escapes from it. She is charged an exorbitant price for her lodging; what she gains is preyed upon by the Madame or the Pimp. When her attractions go, as they very speedily do, she has to lower her price, and she must walk the streets in flimsy finery, scantily clad, looking for custom. Many become consumptive, and are infected by diseases other than the almost universal gonorrhea or syphilis. The belief among doctors is that, as a rule, prostitutes seldom live beyond thirty. This cannot, however, be proved, because though so many disappear it is not possible to account for their disappearances. When trade gets bad in one town these night birds fly to another, and if they die in a hospital they are not necessarily registered as prostitutes. But it would be impossible to exaggerate the hideousness of the life to which a woman is committed who has passed definitely into this underworld.

The typical girl makes her first mis-step at the age of seventeen, when youth is restless and judgment not formed, and about a year after enters definitely the ranks of prostitution. The number of men to whom a woman submits herself will vary according to the price she can demand. Dr. Woolston, the New York authority, puts it at four or five a day as a rule, but gives statistics of as many as forty or fifty in some cheap houses. To begin with a girl may be very highly paid, but the type of man who so indulges himself very soon wearies of his fancy; the girl on her side is never thrifty,

discarded by her first lover she takes up with another; as her men associates become more numerous so her conduct becomes more reckless, and very quickly she drifts down from the exclusive clandestine class to that of the women who walk the streets. The great French realist, Zola, tells a horrible story of this descent, and another, Daudet, writes of how a woman who had so fallen wrecked the life of a man she might have married happily and who had a brilliant career before him. Those familiar with the writings of these two authors will immediately recognise the works referred to, but their titles are not given, for we would no more advise their perusal than we would recommend for reading some of the last written plays of Shakespeare, classics though they be.

But there is no need to go to fiction, even when the narrative is founded on closely observed facts, for instructive tragedy. Here is a man's story of a man; it is written by a physician of Harley Street and is told in a tract entitled "Continence and Its Value," published by the Alliance of Honour, 112 City Road, E.C. 1., a tract well worth purchasing if it is still in print.

"Shall I ever forget," writes the doctor, "what happened at a London hospital, in the ophthalmic department, where I was assisting an eminent ophthalmic surgeon and one of the most rising men in London! How he said to me one day, 'Do you mind taking my cases for me this morning? I am a little bit blurred in my sight. I have a cold in the head.' I said, 'Very well.' And the next time he came down he said, 'My eyes are not

quite clear. You might take some of my cases for me. I cannot see very plainly.' This poor fellow had not the ghost of an idea what was the trouble with his eyes, and, as they did not improve, he went to consult a brother ophthalmic surgeon. The latter examined them and said, knowing him to be a married man with a charming wife and three lovely children, 'I hope you have not been playing the fool.' 'What do you mean?' said the former. 'Do you not know what is the matter?' 'No,' he replied. 'Why,' said the latter, 'you have got syphilitic inflammation of both eyes.' The afflicted surgeon was very indignant. 'Stuff and nonsense!' he said, 'that is all you know about it. It is impossible.' He went to another ophthalmic surgeon, and there was the same diagnosis. Then he began to cast his memory back . . . He remembered what happened one night when he was a student nineteen years of age over twenty years before. The poison had lain quietly in his system for all that time, and only now begun to be active. His eyes got worse. He became stone blind, and then a tumour began to grow in his brain from the same cause. He had to give up his practice, and he retired with his wife and family to the country. No one was to know what was the matter with him. How could he tell them? And so he died, a broken-hearted and ruined man for one solitary indiscretion!"

One can imagine no severer punishment for the sowers of the seed that caused this evil thing to happen than just to realise to the full what they

had sown, to know in the clear light of truth the agony to the innocent that their selfishness had brought about. The whole story of the underworld of passion is as of men and women drowning in a morass, dragging one another down in a sordid sea of slime, or of an Inferno out of which the singed wings of the soul seem to have no power to raise the fallen.

“In the Roman brothels,” says Flexner, “the women must average ten to twelve men a night, in order to earn the high charges made for their keep.” The Eternal City is not unlike others of which statistics are obtainable.

We ought not to leave the actual subject of prostitution to turn to the happier task of seeking ways of salvation without alluding to the camouflaged advertisements by which the wares of vice are displayed in the streets of a town. The following are all brothel advertisements clipped from a popular penny weekly, from which, after a week they mostly disappeared giving place to others. They all treat of establishments conducted by women in the Haymarket region. These places may even be advertised by “sandwich men” parading through Regent Street and Bond Street. The police know of these places, but do not take action until outside agencies, such as the British Vigilance Society, move; whereupon the brothel is broken up, the inmates being either arrested or dispersed.

“Care of hands and nails, Miss ——. Assisted by specialist from Paris. Hours 12-7. Three languages spoken. Assistant wanted,”

“Electrical treatment for all muscular ailments. Apply Nurse ——. Hours 12-8.”

“French lady would receive a few paying guests in her well appointed and newly decorated house. Apply Madame ——. Side entrance. Assistant wanted.”

In a single number of this sheet there were forty-four advertisements unmistakable to the eye of an expert.

Now then let us turn from the evil of which we have said, it is sincerely hoped, enough, and seek the true treatment of the evil. Old-fashioned doctors treated symptoms, modern doctors treat causes, the best doctors treat persons. Symptomatic treatment will not cure this evil. Laws depend upon the consent of the governed for their enforcement; we want something more than laws, although we want much better laws. We want the spirit that inspires the right law to be the spirit of the subjects of the law; in other words, we want a right mentality on this subject amongst the men and women of our time, and, to begin with, there must be right education, in the right atmosphere and at the right time.

The writer of this article was initiated into the great facts of birth and generation in the most hateful way by schoolfellows with perverted minds when he was about nine years old. His father was a cavalry officer who must have known very well what temptations were likely to come to him, but neither from his father nor mother nor any master at his school did he get the information that would have saved him from a great deal of

ignorant contamination. One day, in his father's library, he happened on Carpenter's "Physiology," and, for the first time, at about the age of twelve, gathered some reverent knowledge of the mysteries of sex. It is his principle, now that he has spiritual children for whose development he feels a great responsibility, to have for his first communicants a retreat in which he imparts to them that knowledge of themselves to which they have a right. It will make religion a much more vital thing if the time of confirmation is remembered as the occasion when religion explained life in all its origins and issues, taught the powers and responsibilities of fatherhood and motherhood, husbandhood and wifehood, and offered the means of consecration and self-discipline.

To those who believe in the ordinances of the Christian Church, God has given three great gifts for our trust: the precious Gift of Christ as the revealer of true Manhood, the Gift of the Holy Sacrament as the communication of that Manhood, and the power of life in our own bodies so that we can "have children at our own desire." To all these three trusts man, in his perversity, has done despite.

Yet how the Sacramental Mystery thrills with that same truth that the Madonna lilies on the altar hold in their silver shrines, that principle of sex correspondence that the Creator has laid deep in every part of His creation! When we approach the altar, life is united to Life; we receive the gift of Life and the result is a life born in us,



a reproduction of the Christ life which is the eternal life. Again, we are fed by the Life that gave us life. So in marriage, and the bride and her groom should go from the mysteries of the altar to the consummation of their union; life is united to life that life may be, and that life is fed at the mother's breast, the life that gave life feeding the life it gave. Here, surely, is womanhood's highest and most glorious priesthood; sacrifice and communion are inseparably united; the sacrifice of her travail that brings life into being, the communion of her motherhood that feeds the life she has created.

A reverent education of children is, perhaps, what is most needed, and will be the best shield against the darts of the adversary.

The writer remembers hearing a working man give his boy advice before his departure for the front in 1914. One is glad to say that that brave fellow came back with no wounds that were not honourable wounds and is now himself a clean and happy parent. "My lad," said his father, "your sex may crave satisfaction; well, if that is so, think, you can only satisfy it in one of two ways: either you can get a clean girl into trouble—and I'd sooner hear you were dead a good deal than know that of you—or you can satisfy yourself with a woman who is in common use, and I," he said, with a fine gesture of scorn, "should not like to use a handkerchief that was in common use."

There are parts of our coast where if you go and bathe you will most certainly get into a current that is stronger than your power to swim

against it and be carried right out to sea without a chance of return, unless some saviour comes out to you with a boat for your recovery. If a man knows this he will not trust himself to such a current. Some persons must face the fact that sex currents are equally dangerous for them and must not trust themselves to occasions of danger. How wrong it would be for the authorities not to warn bathers of the danger of the tides, and how wrong it is to let our boys and girls go down into the great sea of life without teaching of its tides and the dangers of its currents!

Let us remember, however, that just as it is a devil's lie to suggest that self-control is either undesirable or impossible, so it is a devil's lie to say that "Rescue Work" is hopeless or disappointing. There is no such thing as "a common prostitute"; beneath the poor body laboured for the phantom pleasure of fooled men sleeps the soul of the true woman. Francis Thompson, in his own matchless language, tells us how one of London's 8,000 prostitutes was good to him. One would pity eyes from which tears could be far away in the reading of this story. Surely the judgment that counted the mites of the widow as among the greatest gifts would approve the delicacy with which this poor sister helped a brother wayfarer, fleeing e'er he could give her thanks, and guarding by her swift departure the sacredness of a brief relationship which to both of them must have been a moment of hallowing comradeship, and, in her case, a sweet charity to cover a multitude of sins. Like another of her class she is made

immortal, as her story is set in language which will live as long as there are souls that can appreciate pure poetry. Francis Thompson tells the episode in "Sister Songs."

"Once . . . in days not far,  
Once—in that nightmare-time which still doth haunt  
My dreams, a grim, unbidden visitant—  
. . . there came past  
A child; . . . a spring flower; but a flower  
Fallen from the budded coronal of Spring,  
And through the city-streets blown withering.  
She passed—O brave, sad, lovingest, tender thing!  
And of her own scant pittance did she give  
That I might eat and live:  
Then fled, a swift and trackless fugitive."

Is not this an idyll of the streets, and was it not, for all their faults, the meeting of a great lady and a gallant gentleman? De Quincey also relates the kindness he received from one of these poor, smirched sisters of ours, and the Greatest of all, if He had the Virgin Mother standing by His cross, knew that when men had fled there knelt beneath it another Mary who was once "a woman of the city."

The late Mrs. Ruspini, who had an exceptional knowledge of prostitutes, always spoke of her work of rescue as most hopeful work. She once told the writer that in a survey of eighty-seven cases, dealt with in a period sufficiently long to give a real test, only five were not doing well. The writer can remember an episode of his own experience as an art student when he found out how one of these poor women whom he tried to

befriend was doing all she could to keep two children pure and free from contamination at the cost sometimes of really hard work, sometimes of her shame. There are pearls of great price waiting to be discovered in this sea of the underworld, and a really Christ-like love will be ready to descend into that hell to save spirits that are in prison.

The vicious principle that may mar the work of a Penitentiary lies in this: that you can never teach what you do not know or preach effectively what you do not practise. The head of a Penitentiary may be a woman who is not penitent herself and is only dragooning the unfortunate women in her charge into an outward unreality of penitence. At the same time, sex-sinners know well that they have sinned, and their souls will not thank you for suggesting that God is a good-natured man of the world Who does not greatly care. In the story of the Mission of S. John the Baptist, as S. Luke pictures it for us, a queue of sinners came up to the great preacher, and the last of them was our Lord Himself ! We can only teach people to be penitent by placing ourselves by the side of them as penitents; the purer we are the better we shall do it. Then there must be a real belief in the forgiveness of sins; there must be no man-made brand put there where God has washed away the stain.

It is a dream of the writer that there might be an order of religious who would some of them go on night work. So much of the work of the world, most of its pleasure, and most of its sin,

goes on at night that surely some of those who are wholly dedicated to the finishing of the Saviour's work might feel it their vocation to provide spiritual ambulances, to go out to succour the wounded and to have first-aid stations to which the fallen might be quickly brought. Much is being done, but more might well be done.

A line of Hebrew poetry may give us our concluding thought; it comes from one of the greatest of all poetic books, the prophecy of Isaiah; it is a line which tells of God's perfect servant, and the picture is so true that it is rightly counted as a prophecy; it is this:

"A bruised reed shall he not break."

Probably many who are familiar with the line do not understand its significance. The reed referred to is a musical instrument. The picture before the poet's eye is of a shepherd passing along the river's bank and cutting a reed for his pleasure, shaping it like a flute, playing upon it, wearying of it and flinging it aside. Then comes the ideal shepherd in the quiet of the sunset at the end of the day; his eye catches sight of the poor little reed pipe lying there in the path, which the next passer-by will probably tread on and wholly destroy. But "the bruised reed shall he not break." His hand reaches down to this little marred thing in which music still sleeps; he smooths off from it the dirt of the way with a gentle passing of his hand; he removes that which clogs its music; his lips are set to it, and, lo, the golden evening is filled with the sounds of its melody!

"Such harmony is in immortal souls ;  
But whilst the muddy vesture of decay  
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

—*Merchant of Venice.*

The following books have been used in the preparation of this article :

"Prostitution in Europe." *Abraham Flexner.*

"Prostitution in the United States." *Howard B. Woolston, Ph. D.*

"A History of European Morals." *Lecky.*

"The Prevention of Destitution." *Sidney and Beatrice Webb.*

"The Permanence and Impermanence of Marriage."

*Professor Alder. Hibbert Journal.*

"City of Glasgow Police Criminal Returns."

"Report Royal Commission, and the book of the writer's own experience !"

## APPENDIX.

TO THE REV. ERIC GRAHAM'S SECTION.

### OUR LORD'S TEACHING ON DIVORCE.

This subject is relegated to an appendix because the advocates of divorce have made it clear that they regard the appeal to the New Testament and to our Lord's teaching as irrelevant ; and we have thought it best to meet them so far as possible on their own ground.

The question to be answered is—Did our Lord teach the absolute indissolubility of marriage, or did He make one exception—viz.. the case of adultery ?

Four New Testament writers deal with the matter : S. Paul, S. Mark, S. Luke, S. Matthew. The two first named are the earliest authorities ; S. Luke may or may not be earlier than S. Matthew. All of them except S. Matthew regard our Lord as teaching that marriage is indissoluble without any qualification whatsoever.

1. S. Paul in giving instructions to this effect definitely appeals to our Lord's authority : \*  
"Unto the married I give charge, *yea, not I but the Lord*, that the wife depart not from her husband (but if she depart let her remain unmarried, or else

\* The quotations here given are all from the Revised Version.

be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." (1 Cor. VII, 10f. He repeats the main principle in v. 39.) \*

2. S. Mark X, 2-12. Here, in answer to the Pharisees' question, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" our Lord, after referring them to Moses and pointing out that the Law's toleration of divorce was due to "your hardness of heart," continues, "but from the beginning of the creation, male and female made He them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh . . . What God therefore hath joined together, let not man put asunder." To the disciples privately, he adds, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her: and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery."

Nothing could be more explicit.

3. S. Luke, XVI, 18. Here our Lord is reported as follows: "Everyone that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery."

Again nothing could be more explicit. But now:

4. There are two passages in the first Gospel which seem to allow one exception to the absolute

\* For the rather difficult question of the "Pauline privilege" see Bp. Gore "the Question of Divorce," Ch. 2. It quite certainly does not allow divorce (with re-marriage) to partners in a Christian marriage.



law—to the effect that a husband may divorce an adulterous wife.

(a) Mt., V. 32—parallel to the Lukan passage—  
“Everyone that putteth away his wife, ‘*saving for the cause of fornication*’ maketh her an adulteress : and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery.”

(b) Mt. XIX, 4-9. This passage is almost identical with that already quoted from S. Mark, except for the omission of any reference to a wife divorcing her husband—which was a thing unknown to the Jewish law—and the insertion of the crucial words *except for fornication* after the word “wife” in the sentence, “Whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another committeth adultery.”

There is no space at our disposal to deal with the critical question thus raised. Fortunately a clear and simple discussion is easily accessible in Bp. Gore’s “The Question of Divorce.”\* Here we can only state quite baldly the result of his discussion: viz., that “the exceptive clause, twice inserted in the first Gospel, is a later gloss, and no part of our Lord’s original saying.” On purely critical grounds there is an overwhelmingly strong case for this conclusion, which has commended itself to scholars of widely different opinions on the actual question of divorce.

Probably, however, there are still many Christians who are unwilling to accept critical

\* Ch. 2. It is a short book of 60 pp., published by John Murray, price 1/—.

conclusions of this kind. To them it may be pointed out that Catholic authority leads us to the same practical result; for the Church has in fact interpreted the first Gospel, on this point, in the light of S. Paul, S. Mark, and S. Luke, and claimed our Lord's sanction only for the absolute law of indissoluble marriage. Thus, whether appeal is made to modern scientific scholarship, or to the teaching of the Spirit-guided Church, the result is the same; and this agreement is striking.

Private interpretation of the Matthaean passages, which appeals to no authority at all but the individual reader's own judgment, is obviously less likely to be trustworthy. But it may be worth while to point out that the generally accepted meaning of the exceptive clause—i.e. that it allows divorce and re-marriage to the innocent spouse of an adulterous partner\*—is very far from being certain.

1. The use of the word "fornication" if "adultery" is meant, is most astonishing; especially as the ordinary and obvious word occurs in the same context. Fornication always means what we should call pre-nuptial sin, not conjugal infidelity.

2. It has been maintained that "fornication" in these two passages has simply the meaning of pre-nuptial sin. Bp. Gore rejects this view as having "all antiquity against" it; but to the present writer it seems at least preferable to the ordinary interpretation.

\* Even this interpretation ignores St. Matthew's pointed omission of a wife's right to divorce a husband.

3. Perhaps there is a *via media*. Betrothal is not marriage, but in Jewish procedure betrothal involved a binding pledge. There was no "breaking off" an engagement; and the betrothed woman was already spoken of as the "wife" of the man to whom she was betrothed.\* Now unchastity on the part of a betrothed woman would be "pre-nuptial sin" in our sense of the term, and yet in Jewish eyes it would have much of the nature of adultery. It is reasonable then to suppose that "fornication" committed by a "wife" means the unchastity of a betrothed woman. This view at least attempts to do justice to the actual words employed in the two clauses; and there is one further point in its favour:—that the Matthaean exception, so interpreted, exactly covers a case previously recorded in this Gospel, and only in this Gospel, viz., the determination of Joseph "being a righteous man" to "put away"† his betrothed on finding in her as he thought, evidence of unchastity.‡

If this interpretation is correct, then the "putting away" sanctioned by the Matthaean insertion means not the divorce of a wife after the marriage has been consummated, but a *repudiation*

\* Deut. XXII, 23, 24.

† The same word as in the two passages now before us.

‡ The fact that only the husband, and not the wife as in S. Mark, is spoken of as putting away a spouse, though easily accounted for on other grounds, is at least favourable to the view here suggested.

*of the betrothal* by the man on the ground of his (intended) wife's unchastity.

This view cannot be further developed here ; but perhaps enough has been said to shew how extremely precarious is the ordinary interpretation of the exceptive clause, even when its authenticity is not disputed.

" Report of Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes," H.M. Stationery Office ; " Marriage in Church and State," Canon T. A. Lacey ; " The Question of Divorce," Bishop Gore ; " Divorce in the New Testament," Bishop Gore ; " Is Divorce needed ?" Kenneth Ingram and Dr. Bosc ; " The Superstition of Divorce," G. K. Chesterton.













